

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

MARCH, 1846.

ART. I.—STUART ON THE APOCALYPSE.*

PROFESSOR STUART has long occupied a large space in the theological literature of this country. He has exerted a wide influence, both by his writings and his oral instructions. He has been a teacher of teachers, and a multitude of disciples brought up at his feet have promulgated his expositions of the Scriptures in almost every quarter of the globe. His life has been prolonged beyond the average of the life of man, and he still continues to bear fruit in old age. He is one of the most industrious men of our times. He is truly German in his patience of labor and his power of producing books. He is reaping the fruit of all this industry in the enjoyment of an extensive reputation on both sides of the Atlantic. The sphere to which his studies have been principally confined is the most important of this period, and indeed of all periods of the Church,—the exposition of the Scriptures, the interpretation of the words of Christ and his Apostles, as well as the

* *A Commentary on the Apocalypse.* By MOSES STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass. Andover. 1845. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 504, 504.

teachers of the elder dispensation, — the sources to us of all religious opinion, the law of all duty, the foundation of all hope. He, who stands thus at the fountain-head, occupies the most commanding position in forming the religious opinions of the Christian world.

The position occupied by Professor Stuart has been the more important, as the foundation of the Seminary at Andover constituted an epoch in the theological history of this country. It was the period of transition from metaphysical to biblical divinity, from the abstract reasonings and speculations of Edwards, Hopkins and Emmons, to the investigation of the real meaning of the word of God, from bodies, or rather dry anatomies, of divinity, to the lively oracles of truth. This was beginning right. It was unavoidable, that good should grow out of it. It was the commencement of progress. The bringing of so many inquiring minds together, too, could not fail to liberalize them all. Had the old method been continued, of devolving the office of theological instruction upon the pastors of churches, with their meagre libraries, imperfect qualification, and absorption in professional duties, the old systems of school divinity might have been taught for ages, and real Christianity have continued to be overlaid and perverted by the traditions of the elders.

The Andover Theological Seminary has been said to owe its existence to the desire which was felt by the Orthodox of New England, to check the tendency that was becoming manifest, towards a more liberal theology; and it was thought by the friends of a more liberal theology, that such would be the effect of its establishment. But the event promises to disappoint them both. Never did the Orthodoxy of New England receive a more fatal blow. There has been in that institution, since the beginning, a constant tendency towards a more liberal theology; and those who rejoiced most over its foundation, have lived long enough to bewail its departure from what they esteemed the faith that was "once delivered to the saints." It has been mourned over in more than one school of the prophets and by more than one theological journal, as far gone from its original rectitude, as quite given over to latitudinarianism, and fast verging towards the worst errors of Cambridge and Germany.

Professor Stuart has had rare opportunity for study. He has had access to one of the best theological libraries in the country, with power to command any book which he might need for the investigation of any subject. The works of the Fathers, the judicious labors of the divines of England, the massive learning of Germany, have all been open to his examination. The correspondence of living scholars, too, has not been inaccessible for consultation and advice. With these great opportunities, what has Professor Stuart accomplished?

He has made himself a Hebrew scholar, and written a Grammar of the Hebrew language,—a work of vast mechanical labor. It is a good Grammar, and with other works of a similar character, is a valuable auxiliary in forming a verbal critic. He has written some criticism on the Old Testament, but his most partial friends must confess, that he has left that glorious, but unexplained book just where he found it. He has told us how we may ascertain the grammatical construction, and perhaps the literal meaning of its words, but the great and momentous questions, which rise up in the mind of every man of thought, as he reads that ancient record, he leaves untouched.

When the controversy sprang up between the Unitarians and Orthodox, after the line was distinctly drawn which separated them, Professor Stuart appeared as an able defender of the Trinitarian hypothesis. The discussion belonged to his department of theology, for the Trinity, if it can be supported at all, must be drawn from the text of the Scriptures. There was more learning in his defence of that dogma than in any other which has been published in this country. What was better than all, there was more candor and fairness in his defence. He had afterwards the ingenuousness, rare among theologians, to retract some of the positions he had taken in his first publication.

The next thing we recollect to have seen of his was a pamphlet on the "Eternal Generation of the Son of God," written in answer to Dr. Miller of Princeton. This was really a masterly performance, one of the most learned and able that have ever appeared in this country. It puts it beyond doubt, by the amplest citations from the Fathers, that the Ante-Nicene Christian writers to a man assert the

derived nature of Christ. Of course they were all Unitarians. This therefore we conceive to be one of the best Unitarian tracts that have ever been written. We know of at least one person, who feels greatly indebted to this work for his transition from Orthodoxy to Unitarianism.

The next publication of his that we recollect, was "A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews." It is a work of great research, and must have cost the author much time and labor. The mere manual labor of writing it must have been prodigious. Almost six hundred pages of closely printed matter are filled, to elucidate about twenty. There is abundant recitation of the opinions of the Fathers, Greek and Latin; likewise of German commentators. But the theological student, instead of being assisted by such a mass of materials, is rather confused, and rises from its perusal more in doubt than ever. The writer expends vast labor to prove a thing that never can be demonstrated, that Paul was the author of the Epistle. The Greek scholar, indeed, feels that the very style is a sufficient proof that it could not have come from Paul. The Epistle to the Hebrews afforded scope for the most consummate powers of criticism, and still affords it. It is the reconciliation of the Christology of the Old Testament with the Christology of the New. It is an attempt to show that the spiritual glories of the true Messiah far transcend the material and earthly glories of the ideal Messiah of the Judaic expectations. It brings up all the great questions of the criticism of the New Testament, — the quotation of the language of the Old Testament by the writers of the New, the distinction between doctrines and opinions, the difference between logical proof and analogical illustration, the relation of the Epistles to the Gospels, the question how far there is such a thing in the sacred writers as the *argumentum ad hominem* — reasoning upon premises that are conceded by the opponent, without regard to their substantive truth. These are the great questions which are brought up by the study of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and they lie far deeper than any verbal criticism, and verbal criticism without settling them, or without some attempt to settle them, is comparatively unimportant. Professor Stuart well knew that he was in the neighborhood of these great questions, and

sometimes shows that he had revolved them in his mind. But to have broached them, would have raised such a storm in his quarter of the Theological world as he seems to have been unwilling to encounter. One of the above subjects we know must have occupied his thoughts, — the question whether the writers of the New Testament did, or did not, quote the Old Testament in the way of accommodation; for he had given to the world a collection of the texts in the New Testament quoted from the Old, with the Greek of the Septuagint and the Hebrew of the original. He tells us in the advertisement, that “the subject, as every interpreter well knows, is replete with difficulties.” And for what is he placed with means of investigation in his hands, but to clear up those difficulties, or at least to do all that he can to throw light upon the subject? The critic who gives dark and doubtful answers to such fundamental inquiries as this, deserts his pupil at the very point where he most needs his assistance.

We know that he may have said within himself, that by a prudent silence the discussion of these great questions might be put off for a while longer. But they must come up, and at no distant period, in the strongest of the strongholds of Orthodoxy itself. They are *the* questions of the present day, and not those of mere verbal criticism; the human mind has reached them; and any Commentary which leaves them out, or passes them over, is calculated for the ages gone by, and not for the edification of these times in which we live.

The next considerable work of Professor Stuart, was his “Commentary on Paul’s Epistle to the Romans.” This Epistle has always been claimed by Calvinism as its strong-hold. The Orthodox world has agreed to consider it a discussion of the points at issue between the followers of the Genevan reformer and the Arminians, — original sin, total depravity, imputation, and vicarious punishment. Election and reprobation follow in the train. But there is a preliminary question, — whether these doctrines are made the subjects of direct teaching in that Epistle at all. The soundest critics have maintained, that the main subject of Paul in this composition was, to meet a practical question of that day, the amalgamation of those who had been Jews

and those who had been Pagans in the Christian Church, or in other words, the relative position of Paganism and Judaism to Christianity. We are of the number of those who consider the questions above stated, to make no part of Paul's purpose in writing his Epistle to the Romans.

But it is honorable to Professor Stuart, that at the peril of the denunciation of all the hosts of Orthodoxy, he refused to go the whole length of the revolting doctrines which have been drawn from the Epistle to the Romans by such men as Jonathan Edwards, or even his own colleague, Dr. Woods. To us, the paragraphs in the commentary on the Romans which exhibit this dissent, are more valuable than all the rest of the book. They show a degree of that personal independence which is the very essence of Protestantism, and without which all investigation degenerates into a mere partisan attempt to uphold that which is already established. But, for this deviation from rigid Orthodoxy, Professor Stuart was denounced from one end of the country to the other, as an apostate. He was mourned over by his old associates, as having lapsed into the camp of the New School Divinity, and we were credibly informed at the time, that it was made a special subject of prayer, that so important a champion of the cause might not be suffered to fall into the fatal error and heresy of believing, that God is just and good.

There is more merit, we think, in the Commentary on the Romans than in that on the Hebrews, greater enlargement of views, and the evidence of a more mature scholarship. But neither of them attempts to settle, or even discuss, those great preliminary questions, to which we have alluded, and on which the whole bearing and significance of both Epistles depend.

Within the past year, Professor Stuart has published a work still more elaborate than any which he had before produced, "A Commentary on the Apocalypse," extending to more than a thousand closely printed octavo pages. On the whole, it is the ablest, as well as the largest, of his works. It is a decided improvement on any thing that has appeared, to our knowledge, in the English tongue on the book of the Revelation. Its merits are, in the first place, negative. It honestly avows an ignorance of the precise historical application of the symbols of the

Apocalypse, and thus cuts off one source of ridicule and contempt to which all commentators have exposed themselves, who have pretended to find in that book the civil or ecclesiastical history of various periods of the world. In the second place, its merits are positive, in bringing together the materials by which the student of Scripture is enabled to make up his own opinion as to the origin and meaning of this production, even when it differs from that of Professor Stuart.

To the common readers of the Bible, the Apocalypse occupies a position altogether anomalous. It professes to be a revelation, but to them it reveals nothing. That which reveals, must itself be intelligible, or it is no revelation. If it is itself unintelligible, then it reveals nothing, and requires another revelation to inform us what meaning it is intended to convey to our minds. The Apocalypse is a vision, or rather series of visions, and the only part of the whole which is plain and obvious, is the epistles to the churches. These are simple, solemn, and truly Apostolic in their character, and unsurpassed in beauty and power by anything in the New Testament, except the discourses of Christ recorded in the Gospels: and they really offer the greatest difficulty in the way of those who are disposed to consider the book of Revelation a poem, written by some early Christian, who wished to embody in the shape of symbols the different prophecies which were then extant, of the future fate of the Church. The rest of the book is a series of pictures presented to the imagination, not themselves exhibiting any future scenes which are actually to occur, but only symbolizing them. To most of these scenes and symbols there is no explanation, no application to future events, no key to their interpretation. The consequence is, that a majority of readers look into the Apocalypse only occasionally, and then rather for entertainment than edification, as they turn over a book of engravings, or look into a kaleidoscope.

It has been so, in all probability, from the beginning. Dionysius of Alexandria, a scholar of Origen, about the middle of the third century, expresses himself in the following manner. "I will not, however, venture to reject the Apocalypse, because many of the brethren highly esteem it. On the contrary, I apprehend that this book

surpasses my comprehension, and that it is full of mysterious things. And as I do not understand it, I suppose that the words have a certain hidden meaning, which I do not pretend to measure, or to judge according to my capacity; but I behold them in faith as things above my comprehension. I do not reject what I do not comprehend, but admire it the more, the less I understand it." This was written within less than two centuries after the composition of the Apocalypse, by a man of great learning, who spoke the Greek tongue, was a native of Egypt, the land of symbols and symbolical writing, a man, moreover, who had access to Oriental learning. If he was unable to understand it, much less could the mass of unlettered Christians of the Western world in that and succeeding ages, who could read the New Testament only in translation and were unacquainted with the ancient pictorial and symbolic language of the East. The best evidence that it never has been understood, is the fact, that no two interpreters have ever agreed as to its meaning, or even as to the period of the world to which it was intended to apply, some confining it to the duration of the Roman Empire, and some finding the fulfilment of a part of its predictions in the career and fortunes of Napoleon Bonaparte.

The work of Professor Stuart fills two volumes of five hundred pages each. The first is entirely taken up with preliminary matters. The second consists of a commentary, with six copious notes at the end on particular passages, which are called by what seems to us the affected title of "Excursus." There is, besides, an appendix, containing an extract from Herder, about the poorest specimen, we think, we have ever seen of that pleasing and imaginative, yet dreamy and unsatisfactory writer.

The introductory volume is exceedingly elaborate, and is a work of much research. The theological student will find much in it to assist him in his inquiries as to the origin, design, author, and meaning of the book of Revelation. The first division introduces copious notices of the Apocryphal prophetic writings, which were either contemporary with the Apocalypse, or composed soon after, that throw light on the imagery and sentiments of that book. There is much in this section which will be new

not only to most English readers, but to most theological students. Nowhere else can these documents be found brought together in our language. After discussing the bearing of these compositions upon the Apocalypse, the author goes on to treat of the object of the book ; the peculiarities of its form ; its frequent use of mystic and sacred numbers ; the plan of the work ; its literary beauty, as addressed to the taste ; the principles of interpretation which ought to be applied to it ; the peculiarities of its style and language ; the time, and place at which it was written, the persons to whom it was addressed, and who were its original readers. The rest of the volume is taken up in the investigation of the authorship of the Apocalypse, and in an exhibition, somewhat curious, of the various meanings which have been put upon it in different ages of the Church, with a list subjoined of the different authors in ancient and modern times, who have attempted to enlighten the world upon this mysterious subject. An appendix contains extracts from Victorinus, the oldest commentator upon the Apocalypse, and specimens from two of the Apocryphal books, which were treated of at the commencement of the work, the "Ascension of Isaiah," and the "Book of Enoch."

Professor Stuart has been complained of by members of his own theological household, for his pedantry and affectation. Those whose sensibilities are peculiarly acute as to offences of this nature, must have found themselves unusually tried in the first volume of this Commentary. The common reader will not only be scandalized, but puzzled, by the very headings of the chapters. He will look along on the tops of the pages, where he will naturally expect to find the utmost explicitness, and he will find the following titles : — "Numerosity of the Apocalypse ;" "Economy of the Apocalypse ;" "Æsthetical Character of the Apocalypse ;" "Hermeneutical Principles applicable to the Apocalypse." Scholars who write in this way, seem to forget that the first purpose of a writer is, to be understood, and that to be understood, it is necessary to select such words as will not only express his meaning, but will be comprehended readily and by all.

It will not be expected, that within the limits of a review we should follow our author through the thousand

and eight pages of his Introduction and Commentary. The most that we can do is, to select certain points of interest, which he has made prominent, and offer a few observations upon them.

The first question which it naturally occurs to ask concerning the book of Revelation, is, — what is it? And the answer returned by all critics is nearly the same. It is a prophetic vision. The author states as a historical fact, that he was in banishment upon the isle of Patmos, and on the Lord's day heard a supernatural voice behind him, and immediately went into a state of ecstasy or trance, in which he saw various visions, and among other things, ascended in spirit to heaven and saw the throne of God and the heavenly hosts. No explanation accompanies these visions, though an angel points the attention of the seer to various symbols. What he sees he is directed to write in a book and send to seven churches of Asia, and they are left to make out the interpretation themselves; a consideration which seems to us important in determining the character of the whole work.

There is nearly as great unanimity among interpreters, as to the subject which is shadowed forth by the varied imagery of the Apocalypse. It is well stated by our author.

"It lies upon the very face of the whole composition, I mean the prophetic parts of it, that the coming and completion of the kingdom of God, or of Christ, or in other words, the triumph of Christianity over all enemies and opposers, its universal prevalence in the world for a long series of years, and its termination in an endless period of glory and happiness, constitute the main theme of the writer, and is indeed almost the exclusive subject of his contemplation." — Vol. I. p. 155.

A better summary could not have been given. The *purpose* of the book lies quite as much upon the surface, as critics generally acknowledge. It is the confirmation of the faith of Christians, and their consolation under persecution, privation and martyrdom.

Thus far critics and commentators travel all the same road. But on the next question they divide, which is, — who wrote the Apocalypse; some deciding that it was written by John the Apostle, others by another John, a presbyter, who lived at Ephesus, others by an uncertain author, who used the name of John to gain credit and acceptance for

his composition. There is nothing in the book itself to settle the question either way. The ancients were as much in doubt about it as the moderns. The writer does not say, that he is John the Apostle. The style is so different from his, that the only way in which it can be supposed to be his, is the hypothesis, that the nature of the inspiration which is necessary to write prophecy, is so different from that which is necessary to write history, that it entirely changes the peculiarities of a man's style, and renders it no longer capable of being identified. Such being the case, it cannot be proved that the Apostle John was the author, neither can it be demonstrated that he was not. The authorship will probably remain, as it ever has been, a matter of opinion. Some will receive it as the Apostle's, and some will reject its Apostolic origin. Professor Stuart gives his suffrage to the *Johannean* origin of the book, to use his peculiar phraseology. In doing so, according to his own showing, he differs from almost all the eminent critics of the present day, both orthodox and heterodox, as well as the most distinguished of the last century. Semler, Eichhorn, Michaelis, Neander, and De Wette are scholars whose names, single or united, will go as far as human authority can go, to establish any point of sacred criticism. We have ourselves been accustomed to consider the Commentary of Eichhorn on the Apocalypse as one of the most masterly critical efforts which we know, and we are pained at the slighting manner in which Professor Stuart sees fit to speak of him, more especially as, if we are not deceived, he is more indebted to him, both for general principles and for details, than to any other writer whatever. We have not space to examine the process by which he gives the preponderance to the arguments, which go to show that John the Apostle was the writer of the book.

Closely connected with the authorship, is the canonical authority of the Apocalypse. If it was written by John the Apostle, of course it ought to be in the canon. But on the other hand, it does not follow that it ought not to be in the canon, if he was not its author. Mark and Luke were not Apostles, yet their Gospels are in the canon. Prophetic gifts were not confined to the Apostles. Few critics now consider the Epistle to the Hebrews to be the work of an Apostle, yet no one is disposed to cast it out of

the canon on that account. The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse stand nearly on the same ground as to canonical authority. They are both in the canon of the Western churches. Neither of them contains any variations from the doctrines of the other books of the New Testament, which ought to bar its admission. Indeed, the question of their reception into the canon is no longer a matter of debate. They are there, and they cannot be excluded. Yet their uncertain authorship and want of universal reception ought to put them on a lower grade of authority than the other books, if we except some of the Catholic Epistles. No doctrine ought to be drawn from them, which is not clearly taught in the rest of the New Testament. Professor Stuart having decided in favor of the Apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, of course maintains its canonical authority.

The question which we shall next notice, is a point of still greater difficulty and delicacy than any we have considered. It is this,—what was the state of mind of the writer, whoever he might be? Was he in a state of prophetic ecstasy, when he saw those visions, so as to describe precisely what he saw, and as he saw it? Had he any choice as to what he was to record? Or were the truths made known to him in such a manner as to leave the selection of symbols to his own taste? Or is the whole a poem in prose, and the place and the visions, a part merely of the machinery and costume, which were chosen to embody and express certain predictions concerning the future fate of Christianity, which the writer had gathered from the prophecies of the Old Testament, as well as those of Christ and his Apostles? Into one of these categories must the Apocalypse obviously fall. The mind of Professor Stuart seems to have wavered among them, and scarcely to have settled clearly on any. Sometimes he speaks as if one were true, and sometimes another, and sometimes he confounds them one with another. He is not always consistent with himself. We should say that his prevailing view is, that it is a poem written under Divine illumination, or an inspiration suggesting the truth to be symbolized, and guarding the writer against all mistakes. On page 209 of the first volume he expresses himself thus. “The book, as we have seen, is a species of Epopee,—

different in this from every other prophetic book in the whole Scriptures, and resembling in part, i. e. as to the method of its structure, the book of Job, the *Epopée* of the Old Testament." Here we are obliged to resort to our dictionary. Johnson tells us, that *Epopée* means "an epic or heroic poem." The chapter on "Numerosity" seems to demonstrate this. The book bears, as he shows, the marks of consummate artistical skill. There are "episodes" in it, or "*moræ*," and "trichotomies," and an "*epinikion*," besides "parallelism" and "*rhythmus*." These things refer, certainly, rather to poetic than divine inspiration. And yet he says,

"Along with matters of fact, I must also class the presence of John in the isle of Patmos, the appearance of Christ to the eye of his mind, while in a state of ecstasy; and along with these, the messages, for substance, to be conveyed to the churches, and then the succession of symbolic phenomena that follow. That he saw all these with his *bodily* eyes, the Apocalypse not only does not assert, but even contradicts by the declaration, that John was in a state of prophetic rapture or ecstasy. The eye of the mind has sharper sight than that of the body; and the visions of the Apocalypse are by no means the less real visions, because they were discernible only by the eye of the mind." — Vol. I. p. 172.

What room is there, we ask, for poetry, or artistic skill, in relating a vision which comes and goes without the voluntary agency of the mind, and in which nothing can be chosen and nothing rejected? And yet, on page 183 of the same volume, our author speaks on this wise:—"If there be any part of the Apocalypse, where the writer is exposed to the charge of carrying his imagery to *excess*, it is certainly in the one before us. The locusts and horses are both objects of imagination merely, not actual existences." How can the writer be said to "carry his imagery to excess," if "the succession of symbolic phenomena" is supernaturally presented to "the eye of his mind," and his office is merely to describe them? Here is certainly some inconsistency, to say the least, a vacillation, palpably, from one hypothesis as to the composition of the Apocalypse to another. Farther on he says:—

"And if John be allowed to go beyond the bounds of real existences, in order to adorn and render impressive his composition, why may he not follow his imagination out, and present

all the glowing pictures which it portrays? It is plain and well known, that locusts and cavalry were the two greatest and most terrible scourges known in all the East, at the time when John wrote. Why may he not present them here, in accordance with the genius of Oriental poetry, endowed with preternatural forms and armed with extraordinary powers? To do so, is no more than all epic poets have done." — Vol. I. p. 183.

But what had John to do with this selection, upon the supposition that the "phenomena" were those of a vision presented by God to his imagination, and not chosen by his own will?

Having ascertained to his own satisfaction that John is the author, that the book is canonical, and was written under the influence of Divine inspiration, what does Mr. Stuart consider it as teaching? This brings us to the second volume, containing his interpretation, or *exegesis*, as he chooses to term it, of the Apocalypse. We have not space to follow him in his exposition of the several parts, and our general view of the character of the book has been sufficiently indicated in what we have already said. Instead, therefore, of attempting to establish or refute any interpretation which may be given of its symbolic or prophetic language, we shall in the remainder of this article examine a single point, which Professor Stuart treats in a manner that surprises us in a scholar of his critical attainments.

One of the most prominent doctrines of the Apocalypse, according to him, is the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ. This result, we confess, has filled us with unfeigned astonishment; for if there be any book of the Bible, in which the simple unity of God is taught, and the subordinate and derived nature of Christ, with more explicitness than the rest, this is it. We are sincerely grieved, that so false an impression should go forth afresh from the high authority of the Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover. We deem this subject important enough, to occupy a few pages in examining the grounds on which such a doctrine is drawn from the language of the Apocalypse, and in some remarks on those passages which have a bearing upon this subject.

We begin with the first sentence: — "The revelation of

Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him." Further than this we need not go. This opening sentence speaks of Jesus Christ as a being separate from God, and denies to him the highest Divine attribute, an attribute without which no being can possibly be God in any sense, — that of omniscience. He who affirms that God gave or could give a revelation to Jesus Christ, denies both that he is God, and that he is omniscient. If Jesus Christ is God, or a second equal person of a Trinity, then he is all that the first person is, with the *addition* of the human nature. The first person cannot make a revelation to the second. Besides, it is "God," the whole Trinity, who makes a revelation to Jesus Christ. This, too, is said of him in his state of exaltation to heaven, when he had resumed everything Divine, which he ever had possessed, or ever was to possess.

Professor Stuart perceived the bearing of this introductory sentence, for he says: —

"With the particular meaning of this verb (gave) there is no difficulty: but the sentiment of the whole passage is a question of difficulty, if there be any; for this appears to represent the Redeemer, even in his glorified state (for such it was when the Apocalypse was written,) as dependent on the Father for a revelation of such a nature." — Vol. II. p. 3.

And how does he propose to get over it? A part of it he gets over by the dexterous fallacy of shifting terms in stating the difficulty, involving another fallacy, called by logicians *petitio principii*, a begging of the question: — "this appears to represent the Redeemer, even in his glorified state, as dependent on the *Father* for a revelation of such a nature." The text of the Apocalypse says no such thing. The words of the text are: — "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which *God* gave unto him." By substituting the term, Father, in the place of the term, God, he has taken for granted that the word, God, in that passage, means the first person of a Trinity, instead of the whole Deity, and by that substitution assumes the very thing in dispute, the truth of the Trinitarian hypothesis. Had he kept to the terms of the passage on which he was commenting, and said that "it represented the Redeemer as dependent on *God* for the revelation," he would have truly stated the whole difficulty, and in such a manner as to

make it what it is, totally unanswerable. And how does he get over the other part of the difficulty, that Jesus Christ is represented, even in his state of exaltation, as not omniscient, but dependent on another for his knowledge of futurity? Let us hear him.

"Most fully does Paul exhibit his belief in the sentiment of *mediatorial* dependence in 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. By this last passage it appears, that Christ remains in the state of *Vicegerent* merely, until the consummation of all things, when his delegated dominion will be given up. The texts in Mark xiii. 32 and in Acts i. 7 (compare Luke ii. 52) show, that Christ as to his human nature was *progressive* in knowledge, and of course there were some things not yet known to him in this nature before his ascension to glory; and among these was the particular and exact time of his coming. The "gave" of our text would seem, however, to imply, that even *after* his exaltation, the Mediator received those disclosures from the Father which are made in the Apocalypse. This is perfectly congruous with the view given by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 24—28, which necessarily implies the dependent state of the Mediator until the consummation of all things, and that his dominion as Mediator is only a delegated one. I may add, that the sentiment of our text is truly Johannean, whoever the author of it may be." — Vol. II. p. 3.

But to our minds, this is getting rid of one difficulty by plunging into others of still greater magnitude. This explanation asserts, if it asserts anything, that Jesus Christ is not *now* exalted to full Divinity, that he is Mediator in his human nature, he is Vicegerent without omniscience, and will not possess omniscience till the consummation of all things. Trinitarianism will be only *prospectively* true, till after the end of the world! The whole Presbyterian Church throughout the world is wrong, then, when it says, in its Shorter Catechism, — "The only Redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was, *and continueth to be*, God and man, in two distinct natures and *one person* forever." This shifting from Christ's Divine nature to his human nature, and from the human to the Divine, in order to avoid the force of certain passages of Scripture, which without such a convenient ambiguity would be utterly fatal to the doctrine of the Trinity, may be tolerated, by great indulgence, when it is confined to the ministry of

Christ on earth, but when this distinction is carried to the spiritual world, to a state of exaltation and glory, it becomes monstrous and incredible.

The other difficulty, in which Professor Stuart involves himself, is his appeal to Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians. The passage to which he refers is this: — "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." Is this "the end" of dependence on the part of the Mediator, when it says, "then shall the Son also himself be *subject* unto him that did put all things under him." If "subjection" means anything, then he will be more dependent than ever, instead of less so, and if he needed omniscience and full divinity, it must have been while he was acting as Vicegerent, instead of after he gave his authority up and was reduced to a state of subjection. But there is a feature in this passage presenting a still greater difficulty to the advocates of the Trinity. Christ is said to deliver up the kingdom "to God, *even* the Father." If Christ was God, he could not deliver up the kingdom to God. Such a delivery as is here described, could only take place between a being who was not God and one who was. "God" and "Father" are here used as terms synonymous and coextensive, and "Father" means not a person of a Trinity, but the whole Deity. This view is confirmed and rendered certain by the last clause of the quotation; — "Then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." No language could be more explicit, to affirm that he who delivers up the kingdom is *not* God, and he who receives it *is* God, and the only God. Another circumstance, which increases the difficulty to the Trinitarian, is, that Christ is here called "the Son," his highest appellation, his name in the form of baptism — "in the

name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," — his appellation as a person of the Trinity, if that form proves a Trinity. Under that appellation he delivers up the kingdom to another, "that *God* may be all in all."

We say then, that Professor Stuart totally fails to clear up the difficulty which is presented to the doctrine of the Trinity in the very first sentence of the Apocalypse, and that it remains just where he found it, one of the most unanswerable arguments that that doctrine is not true, if John was the author of the Apocalypse, and that it was not believed when the book was written, if he was not the author.

On the next passage which relates to this subject — the salutation, we are glad to see Professor Stuart taking strong Unitarian ground. "Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which is and which was and which is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne, and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth." He makes the phrase, "Him which is and which was and which is to come," to be, as it is, a circumlocution for Jehovah, the essential meaning of the name. "The seven spirits, which are before his throne," he considers to mean, not the Holy Spirit, but "the seven angels of God's presence," which are alluded to in the book of Tobit, — "I am Raphael, one of *the seven holy angels*, which present the prayers of the saints, and go in and out before the presence of the Holy One." But having come to this conclusion, a difficulty arises. How happens it, that these angels are associated with God and Christ in the salutation? The explanation is very satisfactory, but will lead somewhat further, we apprehend, than the author intended.

"If now it be said, that 'such an interpretation leads to angel-worship, or at least to the invocation of angels;' the answer is, that the Apocalyptist has expressly, and perhaps purposely, guarded us against such a practice in Revelation xix. 10; xxii. 9: — 'See thou do it not.' Or if it should be said, that 'there is no analogy and no example elsewhere of such an invocation as that before us, in case the text should be thus explained;' it would be well for the objector to consult 1 Tim. v. 21 — 'I charge thee before God, and Jesus Christ, and *the elect angels*.' How comes Paul to class these angels with God and Jesus Christ? Plainly because they, with God and Christ,

constitute (so to speak) the supreme court of heaven, or that awful judicatory which will take cognizance of all the actions of men. Here now, the Holy Spirit is either omitted by Paul, or else impliedly comprised in the word 'God;' and 'the elect angels' are appealed to as witnesses of the solemn charge which Paul is about to give. And why? Because they are 'ministering spirits;' they watch over and report all which is done by the professed disciples of Christ. Compare also Rev. iii. 5; Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26; xii. 8; where a similar idea is found. In a light somewhat different indeed, the Apocalyptist presents them as the dispensers of divine blessings to the churches. What he says is this;—It is his fervent desire that the blessings of grace and peace may be bestowed on the seven churches of Asia, blessings which Jehovah dispenses, by his presence angels, and by the Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ. The definite and specific part which each is to perform in this dispensation of blessings, the writer does not designate; nor is it his purpose to do so. Enough that this was already understood by his readers; and surely he addressed them as if he supposed them to be acquainted with the subject in general. In fact, an act of direct homage or worship is not necessarily involved in such wishes as the Apocalyptist here expresses. They amount simply to this, that he fervently hopes for and desires the bestowment of important blessings on the seven churches of Asia, on the part of those superior guardians of the churches, who are primarily and principally concerned with the bestowment of them. If any one should say to an ambassador, appointed to a foreign court — 'I heartily wish you a favorable reception from the King and his Counsellors,' this would not assert, nor even imply, an equality between the two parties named. Neither does the inclusion of guardian angels in the wish which accompanies the salutation of the author before us, imply, that he makes them equal to God and Christ, or the proper objects of religious worship." — Vol. II. p. 22.

This is very well said. But the author was not aware, perhaps, that he was destroying one of the strongest arguments for the Trinity. All the salutations and benedictions in the New Testament are swept away at once, as proof texts of the Trinity, or of the Deity of Christ. If it is not necessary that the seven presence angels should be equal to God, and Christ, because they are included in the salutation, neither is it necessary that Christ should be equal to God, or be God in any sense, because he is associated with God in the same salutation. All those texts, then, are nullified as arguments for the Deity of

Christ, which run in this way : — “ Grace, mercy and peace, from God, our Father,” (or “ God, the Father,”) “ *and* the Lord Jesus Christ.” And above all, the grand proof-text is lost as an argument for the Trinity, contained in the last verse of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians : — “ The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.” In fact, only one of these subjects of discourse is God, by the very terms of the sentence — “ *and* the love of *God*.” We have only to repeat the words of our author, — “ an act of direct homage or worship is not necessarily involved in such wishes ” as the Apostle here expresses.

But Professor Stuart asserts, that Christ is worshipped in the *Apocalypse*, and therefore he must be God. This, he does not directly assert, but evidently implies, is done in the next sentence to that which we have been considering. We do not deny that Christ is worshipped in the *Revelation*, but we do deny that he is worshipped as God, or for the possession of Divine attributes, or for doing anything that God alone could do ; and affirm that he is always worshipped in such connexion with God, as makes him a distinct being from God, and as shuts him out of Deity, instead of including him in it. We proceed with the ascription. “ Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us a kingdom [i. e. kings], priests unto God, even his Father, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen.” This is Mr. Stuart’s translation, and he concludes his comment thus :—

“ Here, then, is a doxology, or ascription of honor and dominion to the Saviour, through endless ages. And this sanctioned by a solemn, Amen. In what light must John have viewed the Saviour, in order to make such an ascription to him ? If it be said, that John has done so through mistake, and because his feelings were overpowered by the splendor of the vision in which the Saviour appears ; then why is he not corrected here, as he is in *Rev.* xix. 10 ; xxii. 9, when about to direct his homage amiss ? Instead of this, we find him, in this book, often repeating the same ascriptions of praise to the Lord Jesus, as are rendered to God the Father ; and this even Eichhorn and Ewald confess. Plainly nothing less than spiritual homage is paid to the Redeemer here, — a homage which the writer prays may ever be continued.” — Vol. II. p. 29.

Professor Stuart does not say, that the homage here paid

to Christ is *supreme*, that is, paid to him as God. Though it would seem that he wishes his readers to draw that inference, as would appear by the question he asks and leaves unanswered, — “In what light must John have viewed the Saviour, in order to make such an ascription to him?” He merely says, that it is “spiritual homage.” But there are circumstances about it which demonstrate it, however “spiritual” it may have been, not to have been supreme, not paid to him as God. And it was these considerations, doubtless, which led him to speak as he has done in a preceding paragraph, of the two ascriptions, “glory” and “dominion.” “To him be glory, means, to him let the Church render honor and respect; for this is giving glory to God, as we commonly express it.” Of the ascription, “dominion,” he observes:—“When the writer had just said of the Lord Jesus, that he is ‘the first born of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth,’ is it not appropriate to attribute dominion to him here? In the later Greek, superior command, lordship, dominion, regal authority is often designated by *κράτος*; and why not retain its usual and appropriate meaning here?”

But there is another and more cogent reason for confining the meaning of these ascriptions to “honor and respect,” to which our author has omitted to advert. The action for which those ascriptions are given, is one which the Supreme Being could not do:—“for he hath washed us in his own blood, and made us a kingdom of priests unto God, even his Father,” or more correctly, “unto his God and Father.” Now the Supreme Being has no “blood” to shed, and no “God and Father” to redeem mankind to. The person to whom the ascription is rendered, cannot be God, by the very terms of the phraseology. The ascription, then, is paid to Christ’s inferior nature, if he had two natures, both because mention is made of his shedding his blood, and of his having a God. The Divine nature of Christ, if he has one, cannot possibly have a God. These circumstances therefore ruin the argument for Christ’s Deity drawn from worship in the Apocalypse, by presenting a plain case in which it is paid to his inferior nature.

The next attempt to establish the Deity of Christ, is from the eighteenth verse of the first chapter, from the first address of Christ to the seer of the vision; and we

confess that it has filled us with amazement. After describing, according to our author, the apparition as wearing a human form, "one like a son of man" — one like a man, he proceeds: — "And when I saw him, I fell at his feet, as one dead; and he laid his right hand upon me, saying, Fear not; I am the first and the last, even he that liveth." We give the author's translation, and now add what he pronounces to be the "meaning." "I am the eternal and unchangeable Being, who always lives; and therefore I am able to perform all that I promise, either in respect to the rewarding of my friends or the punishing of my enemies." But the Professor says, and says truly, that this verse ought to be joined with the next. Let us put them together, using his own translation still, and see what sense will be made of them, substituting, in the place of a part of the first verse, the meaning which he puts upon it: —

"I am the eternal and unchangeable Being, who always lives; I was dead indeed, yet behold! I live forever and ever, and I have the keys of death and hades."

Who is this that dares to put either a miserable quibble, or else a flat contradiction, into the mouth of the God of truth! "I am the eternal and *unchangeable* Being, who *always* lives. I was *dead* indeed, yet behold! I live forever and ever." Scripture, under such treatment, becomes a succession of riddles, which would have puzzled Œdipus himself. We know the supposition of the two natures, by which this interpretation is justified. Our author resorts to it on another occasion, which we may appropriately quote in this connexion. The same person, who, according to Mr. Stuart, claims to be "the eternal and unchangeable Being," in the seventh verse of the next chapter makes this promise: — "To him who overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the paradise of *my* God." The question immediately suggests itself, — how can "the eternal and unchangeable Being" have a God? Let us learn.

"Some have felt a difficulty here on account of the expression, '*my* God.' But why should they? Does not the newly risen Saviour speak of *my* God in John xx. 17? And does he not say the same in Revelation iii. 2, and four times repeated in iii. 12? Why might he not say *my* God, as well as *my* Father? For the Father is God. Besides, had he not a human nature as well

as a Divine? And could he not truly say with respect to this, *my Father* and *my God*? Those who make such objections seem to forget that Christ is *θεανθρωπος* (God-man), and that what he says, at any time, is to be applied to the one nature or to the other, *pro re nata* [according to occasion.] All serious difficulty vanishes, when the matter is viewed in this light. We may add, also, that so long as the *human* nature remains in union with the Divine, such language will never be inappropriate. Whether this will *always* be, perhaps the Bible has not expressly said; yet it is difficult for us even to entertain a supposition which would deny this." — Vol. II. p. 67.

But where does Professor Stuart get his authority for asserting thus strongly, that Christ was "God-man?" There is something heathenish and fabulous in the very expression. It bears the impress of those ages of the world, when the human mind teemed with such imaginary beings as the Chimæra and the Centaurs. Not only has there been a coalescence of God, or a Person of the Trinity, with a human being, but our author suggests the possibility of its being *dissolved* again. "Whether this will be *always*, the Bible has not expressly said." The passage of Scripture, to which he refers, as suggesting such a thought, says nothing of the dissolution of the union of two natures, but merely of the resigning of a kingdom "to God," — by a person, of course, who is not God, — that "*God* may be all in all." We ask again, on what authority does Professor Stuart assume as a fact, that Jesus Christ was and is "God-man?" He has no right to use this as a fact, in order to explain passages of Scripture which would otherwise be fatal to the doctrine of the Trinity, until he has proved it to be a fact. It cannot be known in any other way than by express revelation. The Bible nowhere says, that Jesus was God-man. It is a mere *inference* drawn from certain texts, itself uncertain from the very nature of inference. The doctrine of the Trinity is likewise an inference, according to its boldest advocates. What strength can there be in an argument built upon a pile of inferences?

But let us apply our author's principles to his own criticism. "What he says at any time is to be applied to the one nature or to the other, *pro re nata*," that is, according to occasion. But he says that Christ appeared to John and laid his hand on him, saying, "Be not afraid; I am the eternal and unchangeable Being, who always lives; I was

dead indeed, yet behold I live forever and ever." Does the speaker in this case give any intimation, that he changes the person in passing from the first to the second part of this speech? Such a paradox, unexplained, would be hardly dignified, not to say honest, in a human being. Among children such a thing would be considered a riddle, or a conundrum, not to be admitted even into serious conversation. But there is no necessity for changing the person. The "*res nata*," the occasion for changing the person, arises entirely from the necessity of sustaining the Trinitarian hypothesis. Indeed, a parallel passage occurs in the eighth verse of the second chapter, in which the two parts of the sentence appear in such immediate connexion as to make it impossible to change the person from the Divine to the human nature, for one is the antecedent and the other the relative. "These things saith the first and the last, *who* was dead and is alive." Now no one but the merest quibbler will maintain here, that the relative is not coextensive with the antecedent; and if so, the application of the phrase, "the first and the last," to Christ does not prove that he was the "eternal Being." The phrase itself, "the first and the last," has the meaning of dignity and pre-eminence, as well as duration, and we think we may say, rather than duration. To give it the meaning of duration, makes the sentence an anticlimax as well as tautological. It makes Christ say, that he is the *eternal* Being, and then, as a predicate, that he *lives*. In that case, the predicate is comprehended in the subject, or the first predicate is implied in and swallowed up in it. We therefore reject that interpretation as excluded by the connexion, and consider it a phrase of dignity, preeminence, and not of duration. The sense then will require no such incredible change of persons, and will be nearly synonymous with another expression often used in the same connexion, "the first born from the dead,"—our leader into immortality. And the meaning of the whole passage will be this; "Fear not, I am the prince of immortal life; I was dead, but I am alive forevermore, and I have the keys of death and hades." I returned from the place of departed spirits, which others have no power to do. Agreeably to this conception, Paul says of Jesus, "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the *first fruits* of them that slept."

In another place, "And he is the head of the body, the church, who is the beginning, (the chief,) the first born from the dead, that in all things he might have *the preeminence*."

But Professor Stuart asserts, that if Jesus does not claim the attributes of Jehovah in this passage, he does in chapter xxii. 13: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." We deny that the writer has put these words into the mouth of Christ. Jesus does not speak till the sixteenth verse, — "I Jesus have sent mine angel." The words are spoken by the angel in the name, not of Christ, but of Jehovah, "the Lord God of the spirits of the prophets," spoken of in the sixth verse. The idea that they are spoken by Christ arises from an entire misapprehension of the Christology, — to use one of Mr. Stuart's terms — of the Apocalypse, which is the Christology of the whole New Testament; that is to say, the ideas then prevailing of the nature of the coming and kingdom of Christ. We will cite a few passages which will throw light upon this subject.

It was not the idea of the Jews and early Christians, that Christ was to come alone to judgment, or that he should come by his own power. He was to come by the power of God, and judge and reign with God, by the power of God, and as the assessor of his throne; and God himself was to be sensibly present with his people, as will appear by the following quotations. "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God *and* our Saviour, Jesus Christ." They were to come together. "The appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in his own times He shall show who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen or can see." Christ is to come not by his own power, but by the power of God. Not only is God to bring Christ with him, but all his pious followers, who are already dead. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus shall God bring with him." He will not reward his followers by his own power, but only declare what God will do for them. "Come ye blessed of *my Father*, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." God and the Messiah are to

dwell with the saints. "The throne of God and the Lamb shall be in it [the New Jerusalem], and his servants shall serve him. And they shall see his face, and his name shall be in their foreheads." "And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God."

God, then, will come to judgment, according to this representation, as well as Christ, and Christ is to judge only by delegated power. Hence such expressions as this, "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men *by* Jesus Christ." So it is with entire propriety, that in the seventh and twelfth verses of the last chapter of the Apocalypse, the angel personates God when he says, "Behold, I come quickly," and in the latter passage adds, "And my reward is with me, to give unto every man according as his work shall be."

That the angel personates Jehovah when he says, "I am Alpha and Omega," in the nineteenth verse, will appear more clearly, if we compare the whole paragraph from the sixth to the fifteenth verse with a part of the preceding chapter, from the fifth to the ninth, which is parallel to it, and in which the angel *certainly* personates Jehovah. "And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write, for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable and murderers, etc." This certainly cannot be said by the angel in the person of Christ. Compare with this the second paragraph, commencing with the sixth verse of the twenty-second chapter:—"And he said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true; and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to show unto his servants the things which must shortly be done. Behold, I come quickly." Repeated again in the twelfth verse:—"Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me to give every man as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. Blessed are they

that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs and sorcerers, etc."

We say then, and we hope we have clearly shown, that Revelation xxii. 13 does *not* make a claim of divine attributes for the Saviour, "the force of which," as Mr. Stuart maintains, "cannot be fairly avoided." We have shown that the angel personates Jehovah in that passage, and not the Saviour. Jesus begins to speak in the sixteenth verse: "I Jesus have sent mine angel." He is the angel of Jesus, not because Jesus is Jehovah, but because he is sent forth by Jehovah and Christ, or by Jehovah in furtherance of Christ's cause. Nothing can be more marked than the distinction which is kept up through the whole book between Jehovah and Christ, who is generally called "the Lamb." Everywhere it is "God and the Lamb." There is nowhere any intimation that the Lamb makes any part of God. On the contrary, he is everywhere shut out of Deity by the particle *and*,—"God *and* the Lamb." Homage, it is true, is represented as being paid to both in heaven, but that homage is paid to one as God for essentially Divine attributes, but to the other for that which excludes Divinity, and in language which excludes Divinity. Jehovah is worshipped in such terms as these. "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." When the Lamb is worshipped, it is for very different reasons. "Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, *for thou wast slain*, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood." One is worshipped because he is "Lord God Almighty," and because "he has made all things;" and the other, because "he was slain, and redeemed us *to* God by his *blood*."

Professor Stuart accuses Eichhorn and Heinrichs of adopting a certain interpretation, to avoid the inferences which would be drawn from the true rendering. While we are upon the subject of worship, let us see if he has not laid himself open to the same imputation. When we saw that Mr. Stuart considered the Apocalypse as teaching the Deity of Jesus Christ, many passages in it immediately

occurred to us so contradictory to that hypothesis, that we felt a curiosity to see how he would explain them. Among others there is a passage in which a multitude is seen who have been victorious over idolatry. As Moses and Christ have been the two main instruments in the hands of God in destroying idolatry, when arrived in heaven they are represented as singing "the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb." Of course, in this instance, instead of representing the Lamb as an object of worship, the writer represents him as a worshipper of Jehovah, and as joined with Moses in that act. Such a representation is pregnant with a strong presumption against the Deity of Christ. It occurs in the second verse of the fifteenth chapter. "And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire, and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, *saying*, Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name, for thou only art holy, for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest." Although the song is put down, which they sung, being pointed out by the word, "*saying*," still because the word, "song," is twice repeated, Mr. Stuart will have it, that there were two songs, one sung *by* Moses, and the other sung *to* Christ. But let us hear how he makes it out.

"*The song of Moses* naturally relates to the triumphal song recorded in Exod. xv., sung after the deliverance of the Hebrews from the Egyptians, i. e. the martyrs in heaven sang a song of anticipative triumph, holding it for certain that all which had been signified by symbols would be carried into execution. *And the song of the Lamb*, i. e. the song which is sung to the Lamb as the Captain of Salvation, who is certain to triumph. Ewald chooses another way: 'The song which Moses and the Lamb have both sung in heaven, in view of triumph.' But where is the Lamb associated in worship with any created being? Such an interpretation revolts against the spirit of the Apocalypse." Vol. II. p. 305.

If this be not a case of forcing an interpretation to prevent an inference, we have never seen one. We say,

that the representation is in exact accordance with the whole spirit of the Apocalypse. Christ, or the Lamb, is not represented as God, even in his highest state of exaltation. There he represents himself as dependent, subordinate, derived, as *having a God*, which Deity cannot have. In the messages to the churches, in which he speaks of himself as "searching the hearts and reins," he speaks of Jehovah as not only his Father, but his God. "To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the paradise of *my God*." "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of *my God*, and he shall go no more out, and I will write upon him the name of *my God*, and the name of the city of *my God*, New Jerusalem, which cometh down from *my God*." The Jewish Messianic idea is carried out through the whole book; which was, that the Messiah should be, not God, but "exalted to the right hand of God," to reign by his power and under his auspices, according to the cxth Psalm, — "Sit thou *at my right hand*, till I make thine enemies thy footstool." God, as the Jews supposed, promised in the second Psalm, that he would make the kingdom of the Messiah universal. In the eleventh chapter of Revelation there is a shout in heaven at the accomplishment of this prophecy. "There were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of *his* Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever." In the twelfth chapter, — "I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of *his* Christ."

In those passages which represent Christ as being worshipped, it is everywhere in his regal dignity, as exalted by God to a participation in his throne, as it were; but never as God. Everywhere he is carefully separated from him. In the seventh chapter: — "After this, I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds and people and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation *to our God* who sitteth upon the throne, *and* unto the Lamb." In the fifth chapter: — "Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, *and* unto the Lamb."

And finally, in the New Jerusalem there is "the throne of God *and* of the Lamb."

Not only has Professor Stuart deduced the doctrine of the Trinity from the text of the New Testament, but he has subjoined a long note, or "excursus," as he calls it, in which he gives this doctrine as a reason for the use of the numbers three, four, seven and twelve, as sacred or symbolic numbers. We call attention to this note as one of the most curious specimens of theological speculation, that we have ever seen. We extract a few paragraphs from it by way of showing how the human mind may sometimes reason.

"Over all the Eastern world, are to be found the most indubitable traces of an original *monotheism*. The conception of this divine unity, however, has received peculiar modifications among heathen nations. I will state some of them as briefly as the case will admit. A self-existent, eternal Being, the original Source of all creatures, and all worlds, and of all the gods who made and govern them, lies at the basis of all the ancient Oriental theosophy." — Vol. II. p. 413.

This he goes on to prove and illustrate by reference to the Hindoos, the Medes and Persians, and the ancient Egyptians. It was taught among the Greeks by the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy. But he proceeds to show that some kind of a Trinity in the Divine Nature was equally universal.

"God, the original source of all things, has developed himself. The creation, rational and irrational, exists. In the developments which the Godhead has made, his personality, so to speak, has become perceptible to the rational beings whom he has created. And it is a fact, astonishing at first view, but not more astonishing than true, that nearly all the leading nations of antiquity, with whose theosophy we are acquainted, have represented this development as *threefold* or *tripartite*. In other words, the doctrine of a Trinity, in some form or other, seems to be at the basis of all the ancient and celebrated systems of religion. God developed or disclosed, is represented as God in a threefold relation to his creatures."

This he labors to show by reference to the Heathen nations we have already named. These polytheists and idolaters he makes out to have been, in some sense, Trinitarians! What pleasure he can take in finding him-

self in such company, we are at a loss to imagine, as the corruption of religion arose from violating the Divine Unity, and this especial corruption was one of the principal causes, according to the admission of all, that made a special revelation necessary. But farther: —

“In forming the idea of God, the human mind must transfer the views of things within the circle of its knowledge and perception to the Divinity himself, and then abstract from them whatever there is of the finite and imperfect in them. So the Scriptures everywhere employ anthropopathic expressions, and describe the Godhead by applying to it names of attributes that designate the parts, passions and conceptions of men. Like to this is the use of ideas borrowed from human views of some leading and striking features of the universe; which latter was regarded by the ancient world as impressed, in some important respects, with images or rather symbols of its Creator. Thus the universe as a whole has three parts, the upper, the middle and the under worlds; I speak, of course, according to the views of ancient times, in which the Hebrews also shared. A like division is heaven, earth and sea. So sun, moon and stars. Time, a striking image in some respects of the Infinite One, is divided into past, present and future. So morning, noon and evening. Time and space in all our limited conceptions of them, have beginning, middle and end. ‘The universe and all things,’ says Aristotle, in accordance with the Pythagoreans, ‘are limited by the number three.’ So of persons, first, second and third. How easy now, and natural even, (we may add,) to make three the symbol of the all-perfect and infinite One, who is and was and is to come.” — Vol. II. p. 417.

We know not how this may strike others, but for ourselves we say, that it fills us with unspeakable amazement. What conceivable connexion there can be between the premises and conclusion, we are utterly at a loss to divine. It reminds us of an argument, well known to most of our readers, by which a certain logician attempted to prove that there are seven sacraments. “Why, Sir, are there not seven cardinal virtues, — seven mortal sins, — seven golden candlesticks, — seven heavens? Are there not seven wonders of the world, — seven days of creation, — seven planets, — seven plagues?” The Professor proceeds: —

“In accordance with this we find *three* most extensively employed in the heathen world, as significant of whatever is divine, creative, or productive. As in numbers it forms the

first complete composite unity, which is indivisible, so in forms and figures that are purely mathematical and ideal, it bears a most conspicuous part. The triangle is the basis of almost all geometrical figures, and is itself unresolvable into any other." — Vol. II. p. 417.

On this we make no comments, but merely remark, that if it were not in a serious argument, we should be tempted to put it down as a satire; first, because totally illogical, and secondly, because if it prove anything, it shows clearly that the doctrine of the Trinity is just what its opponents have always pronounced it to be, derived from an origin purely Pagan and Heathen. This is made still more evident from the next extract.

"The Mosaic religion differs, in one important respect, widely from all the heathen systems brought into view. An *impersonal* God it knows not. An original, eternal, impersonal cause of all things, is never even hinted at. Nor is the doctrine of the Trinity, as such, *explicitly* revealed in the Old Testament. Monotheism is most strenuously inculcated, and everything that would lead directly to tritheism, or polytheism (into which all the heathen systems early degenerated,) is most scrupulously, and (as it would seem) purposely avoided, in order to guard against the lapse of the Hebrews into the religion of the heathen. But still there is, after all, an occult reference to a plurality in the Godhead. De Wette himself acknowledges that there is a threefold idea of God in the Old Testament, as supreme Governor, as God revealed, and as the Spirit who operates in all things. For a plurality of nature, one has often appealed to the plural form of the noun אֱלֹהִים, and to such expressions as 'Let us make man;' 'Let us go down;' 'Become like one of us.' But this appeal is too indefinite to support the allegation. Much more to the purpose is the threefold blessing, which Moses and Aaron were commanded to pronounce over the congregation of Israel:—"Jehovah bless thee and keep thee, Jehovah make his face to shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee, Jehovah lift his countenance upon thee and give thee peace." This is called putting the name of Jehovah upon the children of Israel. How well this corresponds with 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you,' needs scarcely be mentioned. Nor can we help calling to mind also the formula of baptism into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Obvious too is the meaning of קדוש, קדוש, קדוש, (holy, holy, holy,) and the *trisagion* in Rev. iv. 8, accompanied by the designation of the Eternal as he who is, and who was, and who is to come." — Vol. II. p. 418.

Now unfortunately for this last quotation, this ascription in the Revelation is given to but one person of the Trinity, and that person is the Father according to our author ; for the Lamb is not yet introduced. It is "to him that sitteth on the throne." Afterwards worship is given "to him that sitteth on the throne *and* to the Lamb." Now if there was a Trinity in Him that sat upon the throne, because he is worshipped as "he who was and who is and who is to come," then when the Lamb was added, there were four persons worshipped. And if there are three persons worshipped in heaven, how happens it that the Holy Ghost is not seen, nor mentioned, from the beginning of the Apocalypse to the end ?

As to the benediction quoted in proof of a Trinity, there is no Trinity in it, by the very terms in which it is expressed. Only one of the subjects of discourse is God, and that is the second. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, *and the love of God*, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you."

Such are the arguments for the Trinity which Professor Stuart draws from the Old Testament, from Heathen antiquity, from the sacredness of the number three, and from the Apocalypse. We leave every one to judge of their conclusiveness as he sees occasion.

Among the notes at the end of the second volume, there is a very good one on the "Angelology" of the Scriptures, and another on the "Millennium." Indeed there is a great deal of valuable information scattered up and down through the thousand and eight pages of the two volumes. We are glad they are published. They constitute some of the best Orthodox criticism we have had in this country. Hints are thrown out in them, which will be pursued by other minds to very different results from those arrived at by their author. Although originating in a source professedly Orthodox, there are speculations in them which lead directly to the broadest Rationalism. And it is on that side that our fears of late begin to rise up. Our country must pass through the same process which Germany has gone through. There is a progress among all sects, and the momentous question is, where will it stop ?

We are greatly in want of a deep, thorough, religious, Biblical criticism and theological literature, to guide the young

and adventurous who are commencing their theological investigations. We want a well written "Christology," which shall reconcile the apparent Judaism of the New Testament with the spirituality of Christ's teaching and the real history of the Christian Church. With such a book in his hand as a key, the Apocalypse would be a much plainer book to the unlearned as well as the educated inquirer.

We want a new criticism and analysis of the Old Testament, not skeptical and captious, but reverent and believing, which shall discriminate more accurately than has yet been done, between what is divine and what is human in it. At present, the whole Bible is interpreted not by the increasing light of knowledge, but in accordance with the creeds adopted in the twilight of the Reformation. The consequence is, that the Bible is brought into conflict with science, with reason, and with conscience.

We want a new work on the Prophecies. There is, at the present moment, no safe guide upon that subject. The consequence is, that the prophetic parts of both the Old and New Testaments are complete mysteries, and are passed over as such by most of the readers of the Bible.

We naturally look for such works to the Professors of our Theological Seminaries. Parochial clergymen have neither the time nor the facilities for such investigations. They can be successfully pursued only by those who have access to ample libraries, and sufficient leisure for deliberate and careful examination. But Theological Professors cannot accomplish impossibilities. Their ordinary duties may be as arduous as those of the parochial clergyman, and leave them as little time for the composition of books. Theological Schools therefore look back to the community for support, patronage and enlargement. The liberality which has so largely endowed the Theological Institution at Andover we consider worthy of all praise. It is only by the division of labor, created by a number of Professorships, that leisure can be afforded to each for independent investigation.

Would that our own School had five Professors, instead of two! Would that we could bear a larger part in creating the theological literature which is to form the religious opinions of the rising millions of our growing country!

G. W. B.

ART. II. — SCHISM IN THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.*

MR. WILBUR'S book and the various pamphlets occasioned by it give us a tolerably accurate account of the rise and progress of the schism in the Quaker Community in New England. The author's personal history affords a melancholy exhibition of the effects of religious bigotry and intolerance. Persecuted for his attachment to what he considered the primitive doctrines of Quakerism and for his conscientious opposition to the formalism and unsound opinions of the majority of the Society, and finally disowned and denounced, he has not profited by his experience, nor learned the lesson of Christian moderation and charity. His tribulations have not taught him wisdom. We believe him to be, in the main, a good man ; but misled by his enthusiastic feelings, and desirous perhaps of the honors of martyrdom, he spares no terms of reproach against the authors of his sufferings. The introduction to the book is a loud wail over the alleged apostasy of a large portion of the Quaker Society. The allegation is unquestionably true. The Society have departed from the principles and the spirit of George Fox and William Penn. Nor do we think that the recent seceders from it are much nearer the genuine Quaker orthodoxy. Still though the fact of the alleged apostasy cannot reasonably be denied, we think that Friend Wilbur might have been expected to show more of a Christian temper towards his opponents and persecutors. Even in theological controversy it is scarcely courteous, to accompany charges of heresy and apostasy with ungenerous insinuations of dishonest motives. A good cause is harmed by such a course, and a bad one is rendered more odious. It may be that the charges were sustained ; but we cannot reconcile it to our consciences to deal so freely, not to say flippantly and in the worst style of theological polemics, with the character of a professedly Christian Society. The truth does not demand it ; and charity at least forbids it.

* *A Narrative and Exposition of the late Proceedings of the New England Yearly Meeting, with some of its subordinate Meetings and their Committees, in relation to the Doctrinal Controversy now existing in the Society of Friends.* By JOHN WILBUR. New York. 1845.

Making this abatement from the value of the book, we are now prepared to say, that as a statement of facts respecting an important ecclesiastical movement, we have read it with interest. In all our controversial reading we have hardly met with an instance of such open, unblushing, almost avowed, persecution for opinion's sake as in the instance before us; nor of more decided artifice and prevarication in the conduct of an argument; nor of more deliberate determination, not only to silence the objections, but to ruin the character of a religious opponent. We think therefore that Mr. Wilbur had just cause of complaint, and of appeal to the judgment of the public.

Our readers do not need to be informed that for several years the Society of Friends has been agitated with intestine dissensions, growing chiefly out of differences of opinion respecting the genuine doctrines of that Society; nor that these agitations have resulted in a schism, — both parties, as usual, claiming to be the depositaries of the unperverted truth, and representatives of the founders of the Community. This claim neither party can, in our opinion, substantiate. They both appeal to what we may call the symbolical books of the Society; for in this case, as in so many others, the Christian Scriptures are supplanted by the formularies of the Church. The Episcopalians appeal to the Articles and the Homilies; the Presbyterians, to the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Catechism; the Quakers, to George Fox, William Penn and Robert Barclay. Now we, standing without the circle by which their theological vision is bounded, and having no personal or denominational interest in the issue of their controversies, are decidedly of the opinion, that neither of the combatants is truly orthodox when judged by their own standards. The spirit of Quakerism has long been dead. The extinction of its vitality has nearly been fatal to the existence of the Society, from which so much was once hoped in favor of the freedom of the human mind. Quakerism itself in its genuine simplicity, as a religious system built on the doctrines of the Divine Unity and the influence of the Holy Spirit, has almost ceased to have a being. There is not enough remaining to give a character of consistent unity to the Society.

We once supposed that Quakerism was friendly to

freedom and to a lofty spiritualism. We had so often read in Quaker authors the scriptural expression, "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," that we believed the Quakers heartily adopted it and preached Christianity as a Gospel of freedom. We have lived to see our mistake. We find, if not in Quakerism, at least in Quakers, a melancholy narrowness of views, a suspicious watchfulness against any attempt to depart from the symbols of the Society as interpreted by the Rabbins who sit in the seat of Moses, and a determined spirit of resistance against any influences derived from the growing light and knowledge of this age. Quakerism systematically shuts itself out from these influences. It condemns them as worldly and profane. It becomes rigid and exclusive. It frowns upon the idea of advancement. So far from advancing beyond the wisdom of its founders, it has receded from it and disowned it. That wisdom was what it professed to be, "a primitive simplicity, Christianity reduced to a determination of our will to act in conformity to the will of God, as we may know it on every occasion, and even in the most complicated circumstances," by means of the continual indwelling of his spirit. It is because Quakerism has abandoned this primitive simplicity, and sought to supply its place with doctrines having no foundation in reason or Scripture, that its glory has departed, and a cold, dead formalism has settled down upon the Society. The ancient Friends rejoiced in the life and power of godliness, which enabled them cheerfully to bear their testimony in an ungodly age, and to count it joy to endure persecution for the sake of Christ. The history of modern Quakerism compels us to ask ourselves, whether these have not been exchanged for the love of worldly influence and dominion over the consciences of men; — whether the maintenance of the Discipline be not an object of as great importance in the eyes of Quakers, as the purity of the creed or its practical efficacy upon the life.

But what has their Discipline done for them? Has it prevented degeneracy of morals, or differences of opinion? Has it maintained the unity of the Society? The weakness of the Quaker Discipline was not perceived so long as the external pressure of persecution was continued. Their common trials and sufferings bound them together, and

kept them in the purity and simplicity of their original estate. When in the course of the advancing civilization of the world that pressure was removed, and persecution for conscience' sake ceased, it was seen that no Discipline, however rigid, could prevent the intrusion of thought within the domain of theology, nor perpetuate an unvarying uniformity of opinion. It was by resisting the inevitable tendencies of thought, by placing themselves in opposition to the onward progress of the world, that they brought upon themselves the calamitous events that have distinguished the later years of their existence. Calamitous we may well call them, not so much in regard to the growth and outward prosperity of the Society, as in reference to the declension of its inner life, and to the increase of an uncharitable and denunciatory spirit. And we may add perhaps, that these events have jeopardized the hope of its long-continued existence as a separate organization. No creed or discipline, however cunningly devised or authoritatively enforced, can suppress those questions, which men in some form or other will always ask respecting their relations to God and to immortality; nor can any answers, however just, silence all doubts and scruples.

Religious communities must also be prepared to answer another class of questions, those, namely, that touch the social and moral welfare of mankind. These are not to be evaded nor put off with barren generalities. If a community stands upon its dignity, or shuts itself up in sullen separation, or refuses to bestow its notice on any moral or philanthropic enterprise which is exciting profound interest in the minds and hearts of mankind, it must make up its account to be destroyed or rent, or to be left behind, in the progress of the world, a monument of its imperfect adaptation to the wants of an age to the measure of whose thought it has not grown. Men earnestly engaged in great moral enterprises will not be restrained by bands of doctrine and discipline, by forms of faith and modes of church government. Several of the largest religious organizations have recently experienced this truth. They have been shaken by internal dissensions growing out of diversities of opinion respecting such questions, not less than by diversities of opinion upon religious doctrines. Instead of meeting these questions frankly and answering them in

accordance with the acknowledged principles of Christianity, they have either evaded them, or disowned and endeavored to injure the individuals most active in effecting the proposed reformation. The Quakers, like others, have found the inefficacy of their Discipline in restraining the expression of opinion. Disownment has lost its terrors. The Preparative, Monthly, Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, in all the plenitude of their power, cannot prevent earnest and faithful men from exposing formalism and hypocrisy, and sounding the claims of social duty in the ears of a careless generation. A little band of bigots, gathered in some obscure "meetinghouse," cannot increase the effect of their spiritual decisions by excluding offenders against the Discipline from the ordinary courtesies of social life. Society will not regard them as so excluded. The time has gone, if it ever existed, when a Community could be formed to the feelings and habits which Christianity requires by any Discipline, however rigidly enforced.

The immediate occasion of the division in the Yearly Meeting, was the visit to this country of Joseph John Gurney, a member of the Society in England. He has been represented to us as a man of learning, wealth and general culture, of polished manners, extensive intercourse with the world, and a zealous preacher of his distinctive views of religion. In these he seems to have departed further from original Quakerism than even the Yearly Meeting, — in fact, to have been a Quaker in name only. Our readers can judge whether he belongs to the same Church as William Penn, when we remind them that he inculcates the doctrine of the Trinity, the Calvinistic view of the Atonement, the sacredness of the Sabbath, and the efficacy of outward Sacraments; that he regards Christ as outwardly the enlightener, in opposition to the Quaker doctrine of "Christ himself the evangelical and saving light and grace in all;" that he attributes a paramount authority to the Scriptures, looks favorably upon forms of devotion, and teaches us to expect the resurrection of the same body that dies. If these points do not involve an actual renunciation of primitive Quakerism, we have read its story to little purpose. In the inculcation of them he was sustained and encouraged by the New England Yearly Meeting. John Wilbur, a member of the South Kingston (R. I.) Monthly Meeting, and

an approved minister, had previously opposed the views of Gurney in England, and pursued the same course upon his return to this country. His object was to show that Gurney was an unfaithful preacher of Quakerism, judged by the acknowledged standards of the Society; and that the tendency of his preaching was, to increase formalism and outwardness, by diverting attention from the fundamental doctrine, namely, that "true religion in all its parts and articles springs from this divine principle, the Light of Christ in man, as the manifestation of God's love for man's happiness."* It was contended, that the generally received views of the atonement and of imputed righteousness were not only inconsistent with Christianity and Quakerism, but tended to the loss of the spirit, life and power of that religion, which is immediately revealed by Christ in the soul and mind of man. In short, that the modern orthodoxy of Friends is an abandonment of their ancient spiritualism.

The controversy with Gurney necessarily brought Wilbur into conflict with the majority of the Society in New England. To silence without answering him, they summoned him before their ecclesiastical tribunals on a charge of violating the Discipline, in that he had published books on the dogmas of Quakerism without subjecting them to the revision of the Society! He repeatedly invited them to a comparison of Gurney's doctrines with their symbolical books. Evading the true issue, they replied that this was not a question of doctrine, but of discipline. Following up this disingenuous beginning with misrepresentations of his character and opinions, they at last succeeded in procuring his "disownment," first by the lower and then by the higher tribunals. This result, however, was not attained without suppressing the Monthly Meeting to which he belonged, and uniting its members with another more yielding. This is Quaker liberality. It is also an approved, long-standing method of avoiding the inconveniences of unrestricted discussion. We had supposed, that he who publishes his opinions with a view to influence or change the opinions of others, has no right or reason to complain of any examination of his views, however critical, provided it be made in a candid and charitable spirit. His opinions become the

* William Penn.

property of those whom they may concern, either to approve or reject.

The separation from the Society of those who sympathized with Wilbur soon followed his disownment; and now, as in the case of the Presbyterians and Methodists, we have two Quaker schools or parties, each calling itself the Yearly Meeting, each claiming possession of the genuine, primitive Quakerism.

Much as we regret the necessity or supposed necessity that urged to such a course, we have no doubt that the motive which impelled the seceders to form a separate organization, was in the highest degree praiseworthy. They mourned over the prevalent coldness, formalism and want of spirituality. They traced these evils chiefly to the unsound doctrines that had obtained the favor and support of the Society. They supposed that by bringing Friends back to the purity and simplicity of the Gospel as held by the founders of their body, they were taking an essential step towards recovering them to the life and power of religion, which so distinguished the martyrs and confessors of Quakerism. Of these martyrs and confessors no true Quaker need be, or can be ashamed. We do not wonder, that the good and the gifted in the Society should wish to vindicate their names and memories from the rude attacks of men, who under the guise of Quakerism assailed the purity of their doctrines and the integrity of their conduct. The Christian Church contains no names that we more sincerely honor than those of many of the early Friends. We honor them for their earnest and unquestioning devotion to the claims of duty, for their self-sacrifice and self-denial, their spirituality and lofty enthusiasm for truth and right. And we can sympathize with those who would rescue the Society from the peril that threatens it, if the views of Gurney and his associates should obtain a permanent ascendancy, namely, to become an inconsistent mixture of Quakerism and Episcopalianism.*

* Or, of Quakerism and Presbyterianism. Dr. Wardlaw of Scotland says, "J. J. Gurney's views on the doctrine of justification are clear, simple and scriptural, but are they Quakerism?" "It is really impossible to read the writings of the older Quakers without being sensible that there is a prodigious softening down, on the part of this writer, of their opinions and language." "It cannot fail to strike the most superficial reader, what a perfect discordance there is between the

In one respect we cannot but regret the division in the Quaker Society. It has destroyed our idea of the unity, order and beauty of a Friends' Meeting. Our early and long-continued impression of the Friends was that of a community dwelling in "exceeding peace," bound together by the spirit of love as well as by unity of doctrine, — a model of a harmonious, well-ordered commonwealth. Some personal intercourse with Friends and acquaintance with their earlier history induced us to form a delightful picture of their personal purity and social rectitude. Especially lovely to our view were their religious meetings, so calm, so thoughtful, so overshadowed by the Divine presence, — apart from the agitations of the world, disturbed by no controversies, and shielded by the discipline and spirit of the Society from difficulties among fellow-worshippers. A nearer view dissipates the enchantment, and reveals Friends not only as of the same passions as other men, but as prone to indulge them. We confess that in reading the various and contradictory accounts of the rise and progress of the separation in that Society, we have been deeply pained by frequent manifestations of a most unchristian spirit. Like all sectaries, who assume that the peculiarity of revelation must consist in certain dogmatic opinions, and that the obedience of faith is an implicit assent to these opinions, partisans among the Quakers accuse each other of heresy, apostasy and pernicious doctrines, of impure motives and base ends, in the too common style of polemic theology. Acting in the spirit of these mutual accusations, they can also resort to expedients to accomplish the ruin of a brother's reputation and religious standing, which are unworthy of the most disreputable classes of politicians.

We regret that this example should have furnished a new illustration of the almost universal tendency of religious controversies to degenerate into angry quarrels, and to terminate in the imputation of dishonest motives and in open ruptures. We know that this is the usual, but we would

writings of Mr. Gurney and those of the early Friends. I am very far from wishing Mr. Gurney to take a single step out of Quakerism, in points where Quakerism is true. In other points, however, he has already taken several, and those, too, even larger strides than any that now remain for him to take."

fain hope not the inevitable course, in which discussions upon the highest and most sacred truths should proceed. We console ourselves with the reflection, that when the tempest rolls away, the purified atmosphere will minister more abundantly than ever to the spiritual health of those who have passed through its trying scenes; that truth, separated from error and formalism, will exercise a wider and more benignant control; and that mankind, taught by so many painful experiences, will recognize the fallacy of making Christianity to consist in precise theological speculations, and the folly of attempting to restrain the freedom of individual thought and action by the instrumentality of ecclesiastical discipline.

J. M. M.

ART. III.—SAINT AUGUSTINE AND HIS WORKS.*

THE beautiful edition of the works of Augustine, whose title is placed below, leaves nothing to be desired by the student who would acquaint himself with the genius and character of this great thinker of the Ancient Church. It would exhaust our pages even to mention the names of his various productions. We can speak only of a few, and of those which stand at the head of their respective classes.

As a man, Augustine reveals himself most fully in his Confessions. For an excellent English edition of them, with important notes and illustrations, we are indebted to the Oxford Library of the Fathers to which we have already referred.† All who are acquainted with this book will allow it to be as remarkable as any that was ever written. It unveils without the least reserve a life of singular experience. The substance of its narrative we have already given.‡ Notwithstanding its details of early

* *Opera S. Aurelii Augustini. Post Lovaniensium Theologorum Recensionem castigata, etc. Operâ et Studio MONACHORUM S. BENEDICTI.* Paris. 1836—39.

Works of Saint Augustine. Revised and corrected from the edition of the Theologians of Louvain. By the BENEDICTINE FATHERS. Eleven Vols. in 22 Parts.

† Number for January, 1846, p. 1.

‡ *Ib.* p. 9, et seq.

vices, it is worthy the perusal of every thoughtful mind. In deep and impassioned devotion, and in boldness and range of thought, it blends the piety of the Psalms of David with something of the daring meditation of the Platonic Dialogues. It cannot be appreciated at all without careful attention to the progress of the author's mind. Let one only get hold of the main thread of the narrative, and there is no fear of receiving any harm from its pages.

Yet we cannot but wonder, certainly at first thought, that a grave prelate at the sober age of forty-three should write such confessions. And yet on reflection, the fact is by no means unaccountable. Upon reaching any important period in life, men of thought are very apt to review the past, and form plans for the future; to look back from the present eminence along the road they have travelled, and forward along the way they are to advance. The bishop of Hippo, when he found himself at the head of an important see, might very naturally retrace his singular path, consider his former trials and present failings, and rally his powers anew for the future. If we feel disposed to accuse him of want of delicacy in speaking so freely of his youthful licentiousness, we must remember that much that we call delicacy is but a fashion of the time, and has failed to bear that name with many of the wisest and holiest of our race; and besides, that his views of his conversion and of baptismal regeneration would lead him to regard all that took place previously, as having little, if any connection with his present spiritual state; so that he wrote as if recording the passions and sins virtually of another person. We have been offended at much in these confessions, but the offence has passed away after reading them in connection with the progress of his views and life. It surely must have been no ordinary piety that could pass in review such a life, and make every past sin so glowing a lesson of faith and devotion. In fact, the high tone of fervor that pervades the whole book surprises us more than anything. It seems unnatural that so large a volume should be written in the strain of prayer or of direct communion with God. There is nothing like it that we remember in the sacred literature of our age. There are enough of records of signal religious experience, enough of pious volumes of meditation. But we look in vain for a work in which the

whole life, with all its temptations and sins, all its studies in philosophy, all its struggles, failures and successes, has the attitude and breathes the language of devotion, and when it is not a prayer, is a conversation with God. Yet we see enough of the workings of religion in many writers to understand the kind of feeling that animated Augustine, and to lead us to ascribe its remarkable degree in his case to his singular experience and peculiar temperament.

We were never but once in society reminded of Augustine's fervent tone, and that was in conversation with a very humble person, who inherited the blood which the African sun warms into such fervor, and who, in the simplicity of Christian faith and gratitude, delighted to speak of a life extended to a century, in something of the same impassioned devotion that marks the Confessions of the renowned bishop of Hippo. It is undoubtedly the burning piety of this book, that has given Augustine so strong a hold upon Christian hearts in all ages, and made his name precious to many who have little sympathy with his peculiar doctrines. He must be a man of cold heart and narrow mind, who will not rejoice at the progress of the writer's faith, bless his passage from the Manichean's deifying of evil and veiling of the true God in darkness, into the faith that regards evil as the perversion of created good, and looks to a benignant Deity made manifest through a divine man, and calling the soul to relations of personal affection with himself. The eleventh book of Confessions, which describes the writer's remaining temptations, and the two closing books, which give his meditations on the creation, may serve to explain the aim of his work. The record of his mind is thus brought up to the time of writing, and closes with a revelation of the thoughts that were then struggling within him. These thoughts on creation, time, eternity, the soul, God, are not wholly clear, but are intelligible enough to show what process was going on in a mind so reverent and so daring. The dimness comes not from a passing cloud, but rather from the *nebula* of a forming world.

We must now speak of Augustine as a controversialist, and as we cannot touch upon all his controversies, we select his principal one, his opposition to Pelagius. The man is always to be pitied, who is called to take part in a contro-

versy that arrays against him the force of his own previous labors, although the inconsistency may be more apparent than real. The orthodox Protestant, after having battled against Papal pretensions to infallibility, is always somewhat puzzled when a Christian of the liberal school turns against him his own weapons, and in the name of reason, Scripture and liberty challenges the authority of his dogmas. So too the liberal Christian, after arguing with the Orthodox, is troubled when the free-thinker takes the same attitude against all authority in religion, and denies the right of any man to judge for another as to what is Scripture, or whether Scripture is infallible. He must be an able controversialist, who can maintain his ground well against a double assault, and whilst he charges the enemy in front, does not leave the rear defenceless. Augustine was placed in a similar position between two antagonists. As a convert from the Manicheans, he of course felt himself called upon to deny the necessity and eternity of evil and advocate the free-will of man. In the zeal of his new faith he began his work on the free-will before he left Rome, and completed it after becoming a presbyter in Africa. His conversation, letters, and sermons exhibited the same tone. His efforts were concentrated upon one chief point, the Manichean heresy and its antidote. He produced great effect by his labors in this direction. His conversion had created as much sensation among his former associates, as would the conversion of a Paulus or Strauss among the German neologists of our own day. Crowds thronged to hear the famous neophyte, and among them not a few of his old companions in error. He won signal laurels, and many hardened heretics acknowledged the power of his appeal.

This was well, and Augustine blessed God for having made him the instrument of so glorious a work. But when, some years after, the monks Pelagius and Cœlestius began to speak and write of the dignity of man, the power of the will, the value of self-reliance, and to make human effort more conspicuous than supernatural grace, Augustine evidently felt not a little troubled. In fact, so late in life as the time of composing his *Retractations*, a man of nearly four-score years, on the verge of the grave, he recurs to the charge of inconsistency brought against him by the Pelagians, and labors not a little to reconcile the statements

in his earlier work on the free-will with those of the treatise on nature and grace. We do not see that there is good ground for accusing him of any shuffling arts or truckling expediency. His change of position was the natural result of the progress of his mind under its peculiar experiences and circumstances. He had been led to reject the monstrous error of the Manicheans, that evil is an eternal necessity, in fact, a God; and very honestly he attacked this doctrine, and asserted the origin of evil in human will. He had also been converted from his errors and sins by an agency not his own, by human ministrations and direct Divine grace; thus in his conversion he had the fundamental principle of the doctrines of original sin, election, and free grace, which he afterwards urged with such power. This principle would in the nature of things act with an increasing force, as he felt the fearful power of evil around him, the obstacles to the diffusion of Christianity, and the need of trusting in the Divine grace. What at first he vaguely hints, he at last boldly urges, — that human freedom and existing evil are to be reconciled by the doctrine, that man was created free, but lost his free-will in the first transgression, was then cut off from Divine communion, the whole race virtually acting in the first man, and that nothing but the overpowering grace of God can restore man to his freedom, remove original sin, and renew the communion with Heaven. Thus we have the great elements of his system, the doctrines of original sin and irresistible grace. Pelagius maintained opposite ground, maintained that all men were born as pure as Adam, and might keep so by a proper use of their faculties, and of the Divine aid offered to all. Thus the greatest controversy in Christendom, next to that between Athanasius and Arius, sprung up; a controversy that has been renewed in every age, and probably will be renewed until the end of time, for its origin lies in the various constitution and experience of men.

Wrong is done to Augustine, and to the true bearing of this controversy, by ascribing the formation of his opinions and the change from his previous ground, to his hostility to Pelagius and his doctrines. This charge has become a common-place thing, and is found in quarters as various as our English historian Priestley and the German Gieseler.

Schleiermacher impeached its truth, and Neander has demonstrated its falsity. The latter has shown conclusively, that Augustine declared opinions substantially the same as those he advocated against Pelagius, long before the controversy sprung up, and appeals in proof to a letter written to Simplician, bishop of Milan, as long before as the year 397. The two tendencies now at issue had long existed in the Christian Church, and only wanted the right men to bring them to a crisis. Augustine and Pelagius were the men to do this, marked out for it probably by native disposition and temperament, surely by education and experience. In the one we see the enthusiastic apostle of faith and grace, in the other the mild champion of conscientious duty and moral freedom, in fact the Paul and the James of the Church in its imperial age. Like Paul, Augustine had been converted, as it seemed to him, by a direct sign from heaven after a life of fierce passion; like James, Pelagius had been apparently a disciple from the beginning and had no violent nature to subdue. These same opposing characteristics appear in the third century in the fiery Tertullian, a convert from Heathen errors, and the mild and philosophic Origen, who had been educated in the bosom of the Church; nay, they characterize the general tone of the theology of the Greek and of the Roman Churches as distinguished from each other.

Pelagius received Christianity more directly from the East. He was intimate with Rufinus, a pupil of the liberal, perhaps the latitudinarian, Origen. He was a Briton, and of course educated in a church that derived its principles from the East through missionaries from Gaul, as was the case with all the Celtic Christians. Michelet will have it, that Pelagius was a native of Brittany, that province of France, so distinguished for personal freedom and individuality, the land of Abelard, the great liberalist of the middle ages, and of Descartes, the father of modern metaphysics. We will not try to spoil the eloquent Frenchman's brilliant analogies, especially as his view does not essentially militate with the common opinion as to the country of Pelagius. Whether born in England, Wales or France, he of course was of Celtic blood, and subject to the same tendencies of religion and temperament, and in either case deserves his name, *Pelagios*, the dweller by the

sea. His doctrines show traces of themselves in the remains of the Celtic Church, whether we consider the monks of Iona in the Hebrides, or of Lerins in France, or whether we look to the Culdees of Scotland and Ireland.

As a monk, Pelagius must have been saved from Augustine's temptations and conflicts, and both from position and temperament he must have viewed the Divine Being, human nature, and Christian salvation differently from the flaming Numidian doomed to such struggles with error and vice, and saved at last through a baptism of fire. We aim not to enter into the particulars of their controversy. Their lives interpret its origin, and their mode of conducting it reflects honor upon their temper. This controversy has been continued virtually in all ages, yet to the end of time the names of the Numidian bishop and the British monk will be used to designate the rival opinions concerning the nature of man and the way of salvation. Neither the ghostly and imperious St. Bernard contesting the claims of reason and will with the elegant and rationalizing Abelard, nor the dogmatic Italian, Aquinas, battling with the subtle Briton, Scotus, nor the Jesuits struggling with the Jansenists, nor the Calvinists with the Arminians, nor the Evangelical with the Liberal sects, have been able to eclipse the original controversy or hide the names of the original combatants. They were first in the open field, and fought the battle well. Viewed in the broad vision and calm light of subsequent centuries, their experience and position so interpret and justify their opinions as to teach us charity, if not to silence debate, and to make us wish that modern controversialists would always make allowance for diversity of gifts, and strive, as did Augustine and Pelagius, to show that under that diversity there may be the same spirit. Augustine spoke of his antagonist respectfully and even affectionately. We cannot praise him for acquiescing in the imperial decree for the heretic's final banishment; but while we condemn his course, we must not forget how wide a range of good men even in modern times the condemnation of intolerance comprises. Only he who advocates the broad toleration first asserted in modern times by the founder of the State of Rhode Island, can presume to assail the great name of Augustine for his treatment of Pelagius. If we wish to see the difference between intoler-

ance of heart and intolerance merely as a result of custom, we must compare Jerome, the monk of Bethlehem, with Augustine, the theologian of Hippo. The conduct of Jerome is open to universal censure, except by those who are as cynical as he, — watch-dog of the Church, as he was proud of being called, and making it his especial business to bark at all heretics, being, as Jortin facetiously remarks, the founder of the great and growing sect of *barkers*. The tone in which he abuses Pelagius, and also the less questionable reformers, Jovinian and Vigilantius, reminds us of the language with which that noted divine of his time in Massachusetts, Cotton Mather, heaped his epithets of odium upon Roger Williams and Samuel Gorton of Rhode Island.

Although we cannot ascribe Augustine's doctrines of sin and grace to his controversy, we may ascribe to this something of the rigor and exclusiveness with which he held them. Theological controversy is always dangerous, and each party is far more apt to hurt himself than his opponent, to warp his own mind than to work his opponent's conversion. The two looked at different sides of Christian salvation, the one most upon the human, the other most upon the Divine side, until by too exclusive contemplation they became one-sided in their views, and Pelagius was in danger of a self-reliance that leaned toward self-righteousness, and Augustine verged towards the borders of fatalism. Now that very few, if any, adopt the whole extent of Augustine's creed, we stand in no fear of contradiction in ascribing something of this evil to his strifes. He was made too much a man of one idea, and might have been narrowed down into a mere dogmatist, had not his position soon called him to treat a topic as broad as Christendom.

Before passing to his treatise on that topic, the City of God, let us observe, that the emphasis, with which Augustine urged the power of original sin and the need of divine grace, must have tended strongly to guard the Christian Church against some peculiar dangers, especially that of arrogant formalism and self-righteousness, and was needed, moreover, in an age of singular tumult and wickedness, to save the faithful from despair and lead them to trust in a power whose grace is beyond human force or understanding. His system is liable to run into Antinomianism or the disparagement of good works, as Augustine saw that in

some cases it did, although he denied that this was a just consequence, and rebuked the authors of the Antinomian movement, the monks of Adrumetum. It is but fair to say, that, however differently we might infer from the nature of the case, those denominations of Christians who have inclined to the Augustinian school have been peculiarly strict in morals and zealous of good works, as has been the fact with the Jansenists and Calvinists of modern times. The sense of sin thus inculcated works mightily upon the soul, and when thus wrought upon, its energies always seem to move earnestly, and the very instincts of our nature act of themselves, little mindful of the dogma that denies free agency. It is chiefly when the Augustinian doctrines are held loosely and in the decline of devout fervor, that their mischief appears and practical fatalism begins and Antinomianism rages; as the grape torn from its stem, ferments and becomes the intoxicating wine. The Pelagian doctrines, when held earnestly, tend to invigorate the powers and to enforce Christian faith with something of stoical energy. But when held without much earnestness, they tend to great laxity, not indeed to fierce fanaticism, but to merely worldly decency, a morality without faith and a religion without prayer. It is some cause of congratulation, that neither class of doctrines has prevailed exclusively in the world, in the Catholic or Protestant churches, nor is likely so to prevail in time to come.

We leave speaking of the controversy between the African bishop and the British monk by quoting some anonymous lines, which presented themselves to us whilst writing upon this topic.

“To some, hath God his word addressed
’Mid symbols of his ire;
And made his presence manifest
In whirlwind, storm and fire;
Tracing with burning lines of flame
On trembling hearts his holy name.

To some, the solemn voice has spoken
In life’s serene retreat;
Where on the still heart sounds have broken
As from the mercy-seat,
Swelling in the soft harmonies,
That float on evening’s tranquil breeze.”

In such diversity the word of God came to the two champions now passing before us. Let those throw at their monuments the first stone, who have had a deeper sense of Christian duty, or illustrated their faith by a purer or more devoted life.

It was happy for Augustine's fame that he undertook to write the *City of God*, sad as was the event that first inspired the work. It is unquestionably the noblest monument of thought and learning that Christian antiquity affords. It was written upon a subject which might have kindled the inspiration of the Hebrew prophets, while it demanded all the knowledge that philosophy, literature and divinity could afford. The position of Augustine and the ruling minds of his church bore great resemblance to that of the Hebrew prophets, who flourished in the declining days of the national glory. As then the Assyrians were pouring their barbaric hordes in torrents upon Judah and the civilized nations of the world, so now the Goths of the North were sending down their swarming hosts against the Christian empire, had already stormed the walls of Rome, and threatened the ruin of all that was fairest and holiest on earth. When Augustine embraced Christianity, the great Theodosius was upon the throne, soon united both empires under his sceptre, and had already made Orthodoxy the established faith of the realm. Now what a change! Rome in ruins, and none to avenge her destruction! The spirit of Paganism, so long crushed under imperial power, rose from the dust, and spoke of the days of Rome's primeval glory, before her energies had been broken by the tame creed and craven worship of the crucified Nazarene. The old philosophy allied itself with the old superstition, and both croaked like birds of ill omen in the fearful storm. The Pagan gods seemed to be avenging the desecration of their altars, and to threaten general ruin, unless their temples were rebuilt. At this time, immediately after the siege of Rome by Alaric, Augustine conceived the plan of his great work of vindicating the kingdom of Christ against the kingdoms of the world, Christian civilization against Pagan domination. Gibbon began his history when seated among the ruins of the capital, and "amused and exercised" nearly twenty years of his life by a history unsurpassed for its brilliant genius and for its perverse

spirit. The bishop of Hippo in his beautiful see upon the shore of the Mediterranean, surrounded by monuments of Roman greatness, as he heard of the first shock of the power that was to make of the Roman empire a ruin, conceived a sublimer work, and devoted nearly as many years to its completion, with a learning more vast, (considering his age,) with a mind more lofty, a spirit far more pure. He wrote not in the elegant ease of a Lausanne retirement, but in the midst of pressing cares. Viewed even from this present age, there is good reason to regard the work of the great Christian theologian of the fifth century as proving him a better student of mankind, a truer prophet of the future, than the great skeptical historian of the eighteenth century. His work was not on the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, but the Rise and Fall of Paganism and the rise and triumph of the City of God. It has justly been called "the funeral oration of the ancient society, the gratulatory panegyric on the birth of the new." The best historians of the nineteenth century honor the spirit and the views of Augustine more than those of Gibbon. Even in France, the land which Gibbon so admired, and which at his death he left so rife with infidelity, the leading historians rebuke the folly that would dismiss Christianity with a sneer; Michelet and Guizot, with a genius as brilliant and with a learning quite as extended as his, with a creed, too, quite as little tolerant of Jesuitical cunning and priestly arrogance, write of former ages with a reverence for religion that some have deemed too superstitious, and in their views of the stability of society and the foundations of human welfare, and the course of Divine Providence, agree far more with the author of the City of God than with the writer of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.

In the second book of his *Retractations* Augustine thus speaks of the plan he had in view in writing his chief work, after having alluded to the circumstances which moved him to undertake the task.

"This great work upon the City of God is at last finished, in twenty-two books. The first five of which refute those who maintain that the worship of many gods, as held by the Pagans, is essential to the prosperity of human affairs, and who contend that calamities arise and abound when this worship is prohibited. The five following books are directed against those who grant

that these calamities never have failed and never will fail to happen to mortal men, and will vary in magnitude according to times, places and persons; but who still assert that the worship of many gods by sacrificial rites is of use in respect to the life beyond the grave. Thus in ten books these two idle opinions, so hostile to the Christian religion, are refuted. But lest we may be accused of attacking other persons while we advance nothing positive on our own part, the remaining twelve books are devoted to this purpose. Although wherever there is need, we assert our own views in the first ten, and refute our opponents in the last twelve books. Of these twelve books, the first four contain the origin of the two kingdoms, one of which is of God, the other of this world; the second four contain the course or progress of the two; the third and last four, the true issue of both. Thus although the twenty-two books are written upon both cities, yet they have taken their title from the better one, so that they are called, 'De Civitate Dei.'"

We follow the usual rendering of the name and call it City of God, although State or Kingdom of God would be a more appropriate title.

Such was the stupendous work to which Augustine gave the maturity of his years and the whole force of his talents and attainments. It is an attempt at a philosophy of history upon Christian principles. Some have compared it to Plato's Republic, and Schlegel has thought its plan to have been suggested by Plato's work. If so, the Christian shows no little advantage over the Greek. Both start from the highest principles of right in the abstract, but Plato utterly nullifies them by his absurd ideas of the community of women, equality of conditions, military education of women, death of unruly children, prohibition of private property, false distinctions of merit. Augustine, besides enforcing his lofty principles by divine sanctions, connects them with the Christian scheme of civilization, and, in spite of his gloomy dogmas and vain superstitions, advocates those great measures of civilized society, which prove indeed that "between the ancient and the modern world, the Gospel intervenes." Plato may have erred in the plan of his Republic* from lack of constructive power in carrying

* The writer is well aware that some commentators upon Plato have denied that the "Republic" of this philosopher was intended to be a political work, or to give an ideal of social organization. Neither Rousseau, nor Professor Taylor Lewis has been able to substantiate this theory.

out his transcendental ideas, but however this may be, he more lacked the great Christian facts, and his scheme hence falls far below that of the much less original genius now before us. But we must not continue this parallel, nor say more in detail of the City of God. In a word, the writer compares the Pagan with the Christian civilization, both in reference to this world and the world to come ; he describes the moral abominations and deadly superstitions of Heathenism ; strips off the mask from military glory ; reveals the hollowness of Heathen philosophy ; shows the power of Christianity in softening the very barbarians whose inroads were so alarming ; and closes with a glowing description of the kingdom of God, or the true Church of the faithful, from its rise in Eden to its glorious consummation in the resurrection of the saints. The treatise is a noble one, not indeed without its defects, but far in advance of his age, and so far as true catholicity is concerned, far in advance of much of the theology of our own day. It seems to anticipate some of the results of modern science, as, for example, in the hints concerning the days of the creation. It seems to us altogether in advance of that formalism of our time, which limits the power of Christianity so entirely to an official priesthood and their rites. It shows no trace of Popery as a hierarchical despotism. Its author evidently little dreamed that, following out the policy of his master Ambrose, Leo and the two Gregories would make such a despotism of the City of God, and Hildebrand, Gregory VII., would lord it over God's people with more than a Cæsar's pride. Even comparing Augustine's work with that recent production that almost adopts its name, Maurice's "*Kingdom of Christ*," we must say, that much as we admire the ability and many of the ideas and sentiments of the latter, the tone of the English presbyter is altogether more hierarchical than that of the African bishop.

We can say no more of Augustine's works. We have chosen to speak of the three that best represent the different phases of his mind, and show him as the man, the theologian, the philosopher. We have not spoken of his sermons or his letters, both of which have been preserved in considerable numbers, because they are not essential to a knowledge of the writer's genius. His sermons are not remarkable for thought or eloquence, although those of

them that are occupied with expositions of Scripture, such as the Homilies on the Gospels, which fill a volume of the Oxford Library, shed much light on the common method of interpreting Scripture, and have considerable intrinsic value in spite of their allegorizing character. His letters deal more frequently with subjects than persons, and have not much of the epistolary charm, although there are exceptions.

The editions that we have consulted are probably the most important of the many that have appeared, and their very dates and editors are interesting and suggestive, whether we consider the edition of Erasmus, (1528-29,) the earliest that aimed to be complete, that of the Louvaine theologians, among whom Jansenius received his education and undoubtedly took his direction (1577,) or that of the Benedictines (1679-1700,) which now reappears in such beauty more than a century and a half after its first publication (1836-9.)

What shall we say of Augustine on the whole? Shall we dismiss his mighty name with common-place reflections on his superstitions, or vulgar sneers at his dogmas, or fulsome eulogies of his saintly holiness and infallible judgment? Not so. Let us try to view him fairly. He is not one of the men whom we have been in the habit of admiring. The more reason then for estimating him justly.

As to intellect, he evidently had great acuteness and great breadth. Had not his mind been so absorbed by his favorite doctrines of the total depravity and moral inability of man and the overwhelming power of God, and so inflamed, alike by personal experience and controversial opposition, with zeal for his peculiar creed, he might perhaps have ranked among the sages of philosophy, and the Church would have lost a theologian she could not well have spared. Bold systems of philosophy might have been constructed from some of his favorite ideas. The doctrine which Leroux, the "last word" of French philosophy, has set forth so vauntingly concerning the *solidarity* of the human race, and which a metaphysical neophyte of the Romish Church among us has declared to be the cause of his conversion and the basis of true divinity, is all implied in Augustine's dogma of the union of all men in Adam as the federal head. We are not sorry that he did not rest

in philosophic abstractions, prone to them though he was. Had he done thus, he would not have wielded the power needed in his age, for philosophical theories are very pliant, and starting from the same ideal theory, one man worships God in his own soul with dreamy reverie, whilst another adores the Eternal Spirit in rites and temples, thrones and priesthoods; and the most radical Democracy and uncompromising Popery wear the same transcendental hues, according as the mist-clouds rest upon the valley or wreath the mountain-top.

Yet we are glad that Augustine's faith was accompanied by such strong tendencies to philosophical views. Even under his devotional musings, we sometimes observe a tendency towards universal ideas and broad analogies, that remind us now of a Butler with his sober wisdom and now of a Swedenborg with his spiritual correspondencies. His intellect was eminently deductive more than inductive, more prone to trace principles to their conclusions than to observe facts with the view of bringing them within the range of principles. He was ready to carry out an idea wherever it would lead him, without due regard to collateral truths, and thus, as in his views of the doom of unbaptized children, his logic drove him to conclusions, from which his heart revolted. As a theologian of deductive intellect, he reminds us of his great disciple, Jonathan Edwards, whilst as uniting intellectual subtlety with devotional fervor, he resembles Richard Baxter, that most voluminous of writers and most disinterested of men. Yet Augustine shows much inductive power, especially in his survey of sacred science in his work on Christian doctrine, and in his view of civilization in the City of God. Reading these, one is at least reminded of the "*Novum Organum*" and the "*Advancement of Learning*," and may perhaps hesitate to call him the Bacon of an age rude in science and wanting in true method.

He was not destitute of imagination, but he rarely shows this in its common forms, because he dwelt so much in the region of general truths, that his imagination deals almost exclusively with them, and not with objects in the world of nature or of art, whether scenes, characters, or persons. Yet when reading his Confessions, as when reading Edwards's Diary, we almost say, here is a man who would have been a great poet had he not been a great theologian.

Practically he was a man of strong sense. As a bishop he ruled with great moderation, not stretching his prerogative far, but consulting the will of the majority in his official acts and careful to follow the customs of the church. He gave judicious advice to those who consulted him. His clergy asked him to advise them what to do upon the approach of the barbarians. Remain at your posts if your people remain, even if it be to die with them; leave your posts if your people leave, and do not vainly brave the pains of martyrdom; — was the spirit of his reply. Advocate as he was of celibacy and the retired life, he dissuaded the Roman General, Boniface, from renouncing the world and entering the monastery. Augustine advised him to serve God in his present vocation, and consecrate his military skill to the defence of Christendom against the barbarians. Perhaps this advice showed Augustine's knowledge of human nature, as well as his idea of duty. The Roman who was so agonized by the loss of his wife as to forswear the world, soon forgot his grief in another connection, and needed still sterner counsel from his adviser to keep him within the limits of morality, and afterwards to reclaim him from treason.

It is hard to estimate soberly a mind so entirely pervaded by enthusiastic feeling, a head of iron with a heart of flame. He was a man of great affections, engrossed by a prostrate reverence, tempered not a little sweetly by gentle charity. The crabbed Jerome did not provoke his anger, nor did his controversies with the Manicheans and Pelagians move him to forget the distinction between opinions and character, and to malign the men in opposing their doctrines. He was a strict moralist, and in advance of the common Jesuitism of his age, which permitted the use of falsehood for promoting the good of the Church and the glory of God.

As to force of will, he does not rank among the greatest of his order, except in reference to concentration of thought. In executive energy he falls below Ambrose, his spiritual father, and Luther and Knox, his spiritual children. He does not seem to have had great power in personal address, or great daring in professional enterprise. Thought rather than action was his domain. Hence perhaps the relative quiet of his latter years. He wrote a *Treatise upon Preaching*, — the last book of his work on the Christian Doctrine,

—and gives some anecdotes of the success of his own appeals. But his sermons, though carefully worded, are generally very short, and, as before hinted, common-place, and prove either his little gift for the pulpit, or else his low sense of the capacities of his audience. Even when treating such themes as his favorite Paul, he does not enter into the depths of his subject, nor speak as from the affluence of so profound an experience. Yet he was evidently an attentive pastor, earnest in his labors, very discreet, generally mild and charitable, and equally free from tame plodding and fanatical excess. Many deep thinkers have been indifferent preachers.

His writings give us many glimpses of his personal character, and he has made a full statement of his personal failings, which he classes under the three heads of the “lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life.” Under the first head, he confesses a leaning towards the pleasures of music and especially of the table, although we learn from Possidius, that he was quite abstemious and more generous to his guests than to himself; under the second, he allows that he has an over-curiosity in explaining things his own way, a tendency which few will dispute; under the third head, he accuses himself of some intellectual pride alike in his own labors and his view of God’s works.

As to his way of life, the biography by Possidius is the best light, execrable as the Latinity is. The sketch there given would not be much out of the way, if transferred to our latitude and incorporated into the biography of some of our grave old Puritan divines, so far as manners and habits are concerned. One fact recorded, is quite amusing. Augustine was not fond of scandal, and declared his opposition to it in two Latin verses written upon his table; a circumstance which, with the alleged difficulty of enforcing his desires upon his clerical guests, proves that ministers were then mortal, and that a little gossip was not deemed unseasonable at every bishop’s table. He insisted upon leaving the room if his wishes in this respect were violated, and sometimes did so and retired to his chamber. The lines alluded to were these:—

“*Quisquis amat dictis absentum rodere vitam,
Hanc mensam indignam noverit esse sibi.*”

In plain English, "Whoever takes pleasure in abusing the absent, should know that this table is no place for him." His style of living was moderate, free from both extremes. He used wine sparingly, and did not, like many ascetics, renounce animal food. In dress he observed the same moderation.

In regard to Augustine's scholarship, Erasmus seems to us to give the best idea of it, in his preface to the edition of Basle, and in occasional letters. Augustine was evidently not so remarkable for finished scholarship as for extensive information and bold thought. He was little familiar with Greek, and not at all with Hebrew, and although well versed in Latin literature, he was far below Jerome as a master of Latin composition; as well he might be, born and educated as he was in a rude province, whilst Jerome received his culture in the bosom of Roman refinement. Erasmus says, that one page of Origen will tell him more of Greek philosophy than ten of Augustine. Yet Augustine was evidently acquainted with the leading productions of the Greek mind. He probably gained most of his knowledge from translations. He speaks much of Plato and with favor, less of Aristotle and with qualified praise; whilst of the great Alexandrian divines, Clement and Origen, he says, we believe, nothing of the former, and of the latter nothing that is laudatory. Still through his master Ambrose, he felt more of the force of the great Origen's Platonizing theology than he was aware of or willing to confess. When we say that he was ready at extempore speaking, and many of his published writings were taken down from *viva voce* addresses, we ascribe to him an important talent, and give a reason for judging charitably the harshness of some of his pages as to style.

In reference to the question at issue between the Oxford party and the Evangelicals in the present controversy regarding the Fathers, the position of Augustine is somewhat equivocal. Both claim him in the main, and both are afraid of something in his ways. The Churchman is afraid of his Puritan doctrines of sin and conversion; the Evangelical is afraid of his superstitious formalism: whilst the one praises his faithful Churchmanship, and the other his strict Evangelism. The works referred to in our former article show this mingled feeling. Taylor lauds Augustine's essen-

tial doctrines, and condemns his superstitious forms. Unlike Joseph Milner, who thinks Augustine the true light of a dark age, Taylor regards him as having given his influence to the worst practises of priestcraft, such as celibacy, saint-worship, purgatory, relics, and the whole train of similar abominations. We are perfectly ready to agree with Mr. Taylor as to the effect of the Nicene ideas of woman and celibacy in promoting a morbid creed, temper and ritual. Augustine himself, as Possidius and his own writings declare, held very extreme views regarding married life, and was very reluctant to mingle at all in female society. Had he associated more with women and children, or known the discipline of a true home, some features of his theology might have been spared the world. But Mr. Taylor probably refers to other points than ourselves in his censures.

These are strange words for a champion of modern Calvinism to apply to the great progenitor of his creed : —

“ Augustine, the hope, the *last* hope of his times, joined hands with the besotted bigots around him, who would listen to no reproofs ; he raised his voice among the most intemperate to drown remonstrance. Superstition and spiritual despotism, illusion, knavery, and abject formalism, received a new warrant from the high seat of influence which he occupied ; the church drove its chariot with mad haste down the steep, and thenceforward nothing marks its history but blasphemy, idolatry and blood ! The popery which even now is gathering over our heavens in all quarters, is little else than the digested superstition which the good Augustine set forward in his day.”

These words are undoubtedly true so far as they refer to errors and superstitions embedded in Augustine's works, and which might be made to palliate results like those specified, but the passage cited is not fair as an exposition of Augustine's own spirit and tendency. He was surrounded by formal superstitions, and approved not a few evil customs, but these had not mastered his own soul. Unconsciously perhaps to Augustine, the great conflict was going on in his mind, which was afterwards to be waged so fiercely and with such various results — the controversy still going on between faith and formalism — “ an eagle and a serpent wreathed in fight.” In his soul, the eagle had not lost the mastery.

"A shaft of light upon its wings descended,
And every golden feather gleamed therein —
Feather and scale inextricably blended.
The serpent's mail'd and many-colored skin
Shone through the plumes its coils were twined within
By many a swoln and knotted fold, and high
And far, the neck, receding lithe and thin,
Sustained a crested head, which warily
Shifted and glanced before the eagle's steadfast eye."

Whether eagle or serpent shall finally conquer, Mr. Taylor of course believes, will be decided by the issue of the present controversy.

The Oxford scholars are careful, evidently, not to select Augustine's more decided predestinarian works for the press. They show their estimate of him by printing his *Confessions* and *Homilies*. We prefer to give their judgment of his worth in these lines from Williams's "Cathedral," to extracting any passages from their prefaces or notes. The sonnet is no bad summary of the life portrayed.

"As when the sun hath climbed a cloudy mass,
And looks at noon on some cathedral dim,
Each limb, each fold in the translucent glass
Breaks into hues of radiant seraphim ;

So, sainted Bishop ! in the lettered stone
Which still enfolds thy spirit, fled from sight,
Comment, Prayer, Homily, or learned lore,
Christ bathes each part with his transforming light

Late risen in thee. Thence all is eloquent
With flowing sweetness ; o'er each rising pause
Thou buildst in untired strength ; through all is sent
The word, pleading for his most righteous laws.

For thy sick soul, by baptism's seal relieved,
Deep in her brackish founts the healing Cross received."

We must deal more gently than otherwise with the last two lines, since Augustine himself was an advocate of baptismal regeneration. Evidently neither Evangelicals nor High-churchmen can make the ancient saint wholly subservient to their minds.

Not a few of our readers will not regret the inability of either party to make sectarian capital of so great a name, and will be more eager to learn the lessons taught by his life. They will require little aid to lead them to appreciate the double lesson conveyed; — the danger of allowing one favorite notion to master the mind, and of suffering the pride of logical consistency to enslave the intuitions of the reason, the undefinable instincts of our moral nature, to any abstract formula, whether of philosophy or theology; on the other hand, the power of a strong faith in the revealed God, the peace of a soul assured of forgiveness, resting in the Divine will, and giving all its energies to the good of man and the advancement of the Divine kingdom. Herein was thy chief glory, Augustine, heart of flame! an absorbing faith and love, born of a deep personal experience, and never quenched or eclipsed by strifes, dogmas or forms. Burn and shine forever in that golden candle-stick in which not one church, but all Christians have exalted thy memory!

Divide the strong minds of Christendom into four chief classes, according to their affinity with the leading Apostles, and the principal tendencies of religion, — with Peter in his ecclesiastical zeal, John in his devout contemplation, James with his ethical exactness, and Paul, the late convert, with his dialectical force and systematic divinity; Augustine deserves a rank next to Paul among the dialecticians of the Church. Next to the Apostle of the Gentiles, he is leader of the illustrious band, who have meditated on sin and its remedy with the power of great intellect and the riches of deep experience, until their very logic has burned with eloquence and they have become the chief apostles of the doctrines most mighty in conversion. He is not of the stamp of Cyprian and Ambrose and Hildebrand, nor of Origen and Chrysostom and Fenelon, nor of Pelagius and Butler and Paley; it is enough to say, that as a thinker he leads in the path where Calvin, Pascal, Leighton, Edwards, Chalmers have followed, whilst in respect to Christian experience he stands foremost among the Luthers and Bunyans of the Church.

S. O.

ART. IV. — RETRIBUTION.

WE are continually reaping the fruits of our past character and conduct, and we are continually sowing seeds, which in the following periods of our lives will bring forth sweet or bitter fruits. Each successive portion of life is intimately connected with all that have gone before it, and with all that will come after it. The present is what the past has made it, and, according as it is well or ill used, will essentially modify the future. Neglected youth is followed by manhood without respectability, and wasted manhood by an old age of unhonored want. Dishonesty sooner or later brings forth the fruits of shame. Idleness results in poverty. Intemperance and debauchery lead to disease and pain, and end in premature decay and death.

This, we have reason to believe, is a universal law of God's moral government. It operates in the future life, as well as in the present. As the different stages of our mortal existence are indissolubly connected with each other, so is the life to come connected with this. This life is designed to be a preparation for that. As we have sowed here, we shall reap there. We shall experience there an exact and righteous retribution of our faithfulness or unfaithfulness here. This doctrine, the doctrine of future retribution, we propose briefly to illustrate and defend in the present article. It is going back, indeed, to the primary elements of our religion, but it is always well to recur to first principles. It may not be unprofitable to consider in what manner this truth is developed in the Gospel, and also to look at some of the consequences that follow from a denial of it,—in what light such a denial places this life and the life to come, in what light it places our responsibilities as immortal beings.

It is impossible, we conceive, to read the New Testament with an ordinary degree of attention, without perceiving that it promises eternal life on certain conditions. This fact necessarily implies, that eternal life will not be bestowed without a fulfilment of those conditions. Nothing can be more discordant from the prevalent tone of the Gospel on this subject, than the assertion, that the great blessing it was designed to bestow upon men, will be con-

ferred upon them without any agency or cooperation of their own ; that its object is, to make men happy in spite of themselves. It is uniformly represented, that heaven is to be sought, to be striven for, to be won. It is the reward of care, forethought, watchfulness, endeavor. It is the result of a character and a life. It is said, that it may be lost ; that there is danger of exclusion from it. We will cite a few specimens of this general tenor of the Gospel. We find some of them in the first discourse of our Lord that occurs in the New Testament, the Sermon on the Mount. We are there admonished, for example, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal ; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal." Here a figure is borrowed from the care and labor with which men are accustomed to make provision for the future of the present life. Does it not imply, that at least equal endeavor is necessary to secure our well-being in the life to come ? Is any encouragement held out to the expectation, that men will find treasures laid up for them in heaven, whether they have taken any pains to lay them up for themselves or not ? In the same discourse Jesus says, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven ; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." Here active obedience to the will of God, is represented as the condition of admission to Christ's kingdom. And a little farther on, we find expressly asserted, what, indeed, is necessarily implied in the words just quoted, that failure to comply with that condition will work exclusion from the kingdom ; to those who have rendered him a mere lip-service, without true obedience, he will say, "I never knew you ; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." And in the conclusion of that discourse, the man who rests his hope on any other foundation than obedience to the words of Christ, is compared to a man who built upon the sand, and whose house was overturned and ruined. In the parable by which the retribution that takes place under the Gospel dispensation is illustrated, the servants who had faithfully improved the talents committed to their trust, received high rewards, whilst the slothful servant, who had neglected to increase

the one talent committed to him, was punished by exclusion from his master's presence. In a declaration of the principles on which judgment will be passed on those who stand before the tribunal of Christ, it is said, that they who have performed deeds of mercy and charity will be approved, whilst those who have neglected to relieve the poor and suffering will receive the sentence of condemnation.

These are a few specimens, merely, of the manner in which the New Testament speaks of the terms on which men may share the blessings of that kingdom, which commences on earth, and extends into the world to come. It is the righteous, who "shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." It is to the pure in heart that the promise is made, that "they shall see God." Without holiness no man can see him, either in this life, or in the future. Jesus also spoke expressly of a retribution to take place in the world to come, of a judgment to be passed after death. In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, he lifts the mysterious veil that separates the two worlds, and gives us a glimpse of the spiritual state. That glimpse reveals it as a state of retribution. The rich man is there represented as suffering the consequences of his luxurious, sensual, selfish life, of his abuse of wealth, and neglect of the means and opportunities of usefulness that it placed in his hands; and the beggar, as resting from his sorrows, and enjoying the rewards of his faith and patience. This is the obvious and plain meaning of the passage, and it is a hard task for ingenuity to torture it into any other. That it illustrates the subject of retribution, who can doubt? But retribution when and where? That measure of retribution that takes place in the present life? Our Lord frequently drew comparisons from the common occurrences of life, to illustrate subjects connected with the spiritual world; but that he should, in this single case, have reversed the process, and should have borrowed from the shadowy region beyond the grave, and from a popular opinion of punishment there, which, by supposition, would be false, images by which to make more clear what was daily passing before men's eyes, is altogether incredible. The only rational explanation of the passage is, that it discloses to us the spiritual world; and it teaches, that there is suffering in that world for sin. Jesus again asserted this truth in express terms, when he

uttered those solemn words, "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

That nothing impure can enter into the kingdom of God, that happiness depends on character, that the sinner never can be truly happy so long as he continues to be a sinner, and that this is a fixed law of our moral nature, and takes effect in every stage of our being, the future as well as the present, is a truth too plain to be denied; and we believe it never has been denied. If, then, there be no suffering in the future life for the sins of this, if all men, of every variety of character formed in this life, pass immediately into an equal degree of happiness in the next, it must be, because the characters of those who have lived in sin and neglect, are changed by the mere process of death; and we must suppose it possible, that a man may sink to sleep in this world, steeped in moral pollution, and wake in the next, a perfectly pure and holy being. Is this probable? Does reason or Scripture afford any ground for such a supposition? How can death be supposed to possess this mighty moral power? It is a mere physical event. It is the dropping away, from around the spirit, of the mortal coil that here environs it. The soul passes into the spiritual world; passes as it is, with the character it has formed. Character is an attribute of the soul, not of the body, and cannot be laid aside with the body. If by a long life of sensuality, of sordid or reckless passion, of worldliness and selfishness, that soul have contracted weakness, degradation and pollution, it is contrary to all that we are most deeply and certainly conscious of, respecting our moral and spiritual nature, to imagine that all those consequences of an evil life can be undone in an instant, and the soul be at once prepared for spiritual employments and pleasures. Surely its first experience in that world must be that of acute suffering for its abused and perverted powers. If it ever can be restored to holiness and happiness, it can only be through the agonies of remorse, and the protracted pains and toils of reformation.

No one, we repeat, denies that happiness depends on character. It is a fact,—and we may see abundant

illustration of it in this world, though the experience of the present life is not long enough to afford a complete verification of it,—that God has established an indissoluble connection between holiness and happiness, and between sin and misery. It is also a fact, in testimony of which we appeal to universal consciousness, that character must be self-acquired. It cannot be put upon a man, without his own agency. We do not forget the necessity of Divine aid. We hold a high doctrine on that subject. But we say, that it is only an aid, and not a substitute. It is a help to those only, who will help themselves. The acquisition of a holy character must ultimately be a man's own work. It is idle to speak of sin being put off, and righteousness put on, as the squalid rags of the Prodigal were taken away, and the best robe put upon him. And the attainment of exalted religious character is a slow and gradual process. The desire, the purpose, of seeking it may, indeed, be suddenly formed, and be a source of a certain measure of peace and satisfaction. But that is only a beginning. The consummation, especially after the spiritual powers have been impaired by long habits of sin, is a long, laborious, difficult work. These facts are in direct opposition to the idea, that there is anything in the mere event of death, to work a complete and radical change of character. And apart from these considerations, what, on the supposition that the Gospel does not teach future retribution, is its message to men? It says to them, 'Be pure and righteous; love God and man; if you have sinned, repent, reform and live a righteous life. This is the work given you to do; and if you do it not,—it is of no great consequence; it may make some difference here, but it will make none hereafter. If you do it not for yourself, death will do it for you.' Is this the appeal of the Gospel to the hearts of men? Is this a voice to arouse a world lying in wickedness?

A denial of retribution in the future state almost entirely cuts off the connection between the two stages of our existence, and leaves the present without a purpose. Many of the mysteries of the present life are solved, by supposing it to be the beginning of a scheme of discipline and education, which is to be consummated hereafter. Sorrow and suffering can be accounted for, by considering them as

means of purifying the soul and preparing it for a higher state of being. The successes of the wicked, and the losses and disappointments of the good, cease to perplex us, when we look forward to a state of righteous retribution, in which these seemingly unequal allotments will be adjusted. But take away the idea of future retribution, and we are deprived of this explanation. This life becomes an insolvable enigma. Suffering, which can no longer be regarded as a preparation for a state of being, which will be the same, whether it is prepared for or not, assumes the shape of gratuitous cruelty; and retribution, which, on this supposition, should be completed and made obvious within the compass of this mortal life, is not what we should expect from a righteous Judge. If all men, without respect to their character and conduct in this life, commence their future being from precisely the same starting-point, there is no reason why they should have been placed in this world at all.

One great source of the elevating and ennobling influence of the Gospel upon the soul of man, is the revelation of immortality. Suppose a living faith in that truth to be suddenly imparted to one who had never conceived it before, and how instantaneously is he changed in his own eyes. With what dignity and glory does he feel himself at once invested. He is no longer the creature of a day. He is no longer bound to the fleeting vanities and transient interests of earth. Death has no more power over him. He is an immortal being. Glorious hopes are opened before him. Solemn responsibilities are laid upon him. A great work is given him to do. If motive, opportunity, a wide and long career of action, have any power to exalt, expand and quicken the soul of man and inspire lofty purposes, what so suited to produce this effect, as the felt realities of the eternal world? But this "power of an endless life" depends on the connection of that life with the present; on the conviction, that what we do here will affect our condition there. Deny this connection, and the greater part of our interest in the doctrine of immortality is destroyed. It affords us an expectation of a future good, indeed; but it is not an inspiring hope, because we can do nothing to realize it. It lays upon us no care or responsibility, for our destiny will be accomplished, with or without our own efforts. The best that can be said of it is, that it

imparts the lazy comfort of an agreeable fatalism. So far as motive to noble action is concerned, it might as well not have been revealed.

Moreover, the exclusion of the idea of retribution from our view of the future life, must deprive us of some of the grounds on which men may be most effectually urged to the practice of virtue. What ground is left? The native beauty, excellence and desirableness of virtue, and that measure of good with which it is ordinarily rewarded in the present life ; — the same ground, except that the Christian has the means of gaining a far nobler conception of what virtue is, that was occupied by the moral teachers of Heathen antiquity. To the first of these grounds we would do full justice. We believe that much can be effected by a true and strong appeal to men's moral instincts. We are far from thinking that all goodness, or the highest goodness, is the mere offspring of hope and fear. But the fear of the Lord, if not the consummation, is often "the beginning of wisdom." A man may have become so degraded by long continuance in sin, that all access to his heart may be barred, except through the avenue of fear. His moral perception may be so blinded by evil habit, or so dazzled and bewildered by the intoxications of appetite and passion, as to be unable to see any beauty in virtue, that he should desire it. Besides, even if the loveliness and excellence of virtue are fully acknowledged, still the attainment of it costs arduous and patient effort, and temptations to remit that effort are continually presented by the lower propensities and desires ; and if man is told, that virtue, with its consequent happiness, certainly awaits him at no very distant crisis of his being, is it not to be expected, from all that we know of human nature, that he will seize the present gratification, and be willing to wait for the virtue that will soon be his without a struggle? Suppose a youth, in answer to an appeal made to him on the ground we are considering, should say, — 'The world and sense offer me the most glowing enjoyments, the most intense gratifications, which really seem to me the highest good I can possess, while the charms of virtue, of which you speak, look to me dim, cold, and undesirable. I choose the pleasures of sin, and will take my chance of the evil consequences which sometimes follow them, in the present

life. I am willing to run that risk, for the sake of the prize I may win ; and if I am unlucky, it will soon be over, and I shall enter on that perfect happiness, which, you tell me, I cannot escape.' What, we ask, could be replied to him ?

If there is no retribution in the future life, there is no perfect retribution at all ; for such retribution does not take place in this world. Actual suffering and happiness are not exactly proportioned to good and ill desert. Unquestionably it is true, in general, that the religious man, the pure, benevolent, devout man, enjoys this life more highly than the man of an opposite character. There is nothing in his religion, to prevent his deriving from the good things of this life the greatest enjoyment they are capable of yielding. Besides these, he has his peculiar sources of happiness, and under the sufferings incident alike to all, he has a support and consolation that the irreligious man knows not of. The irreligious man loses this enjoyment. But the loss causes him no actual suffering. He is unconscious of it. He does not believe it, when you tell him of it. He will live and die in ignorance of it, and will never really feel it, unless he awake to a painful consciousness of it in the spiritual world, by finding himself unprepared for the occupations and pleasures of that world, by discovering that the whole of his busy life has been a laborious disqualification for the state upon which he has entered. We have said, that the superior happiness of the religious man is the ordinary rule. In order that temporal retribution should be perfect, the rule should be without exception. If there be a single exception, a wrong is done to the individual in whose case it occurs. But there are such exceptions. Eminently holy and devout men, from some infelicity of temperament, or unfortunate bias of opinion, have passed a wretched life, with the distressing apprehension that they were under the curse of God ; and thus their religion was, in this life, to them a perpetual source of unhappiness. The reproaches of conscience are often in inverse proportion to guilt. The habitually conscientious man, who is tenderly alive to the smallest departure from rectitude, suffers a poignant anguish from the commission of a trifling offence ; whilst the habitual violator of God's law, who has hardened his heart against the admonitions of conscience, or silenced

its voice by neglect, may daily commit flagrant transgressions without uneasiness. It is a familiar fact, that by persevering disregard of conscience a man can, if he will, relieve himself from its stings. There is something appalling in this ominous silence of conscience, on the supposition that, in the world to come, she will reassert her authority in stern and awful accents; but if her jurisdiction is confined to this life, if in the present world we hear the last of her voice, it must be confessed that she bears the sword in vain; she is incompetent to her office; she fails of dispensing the even justice for which she sits in the judgment-seat of the soul.

If we look at the outward retributions of goodness and wickedness, we find yet greater inequalities. The sensualist sometimes revels in every species of criminal indulgence, and, by the natural strength of his constitution, escapes the disease and suffering that are the usual consequences, and thus enjoys the gratifications of sin without paying their temporal penalty. The dishonest man may, by the excess of his cunning, contrive to maintain a fair show in the eyes of the world; or, by the excess of his shamelessness, he may outbrave the opinion of men, and find satisfaction in his ill-gotten wealth, without feeling as a punishment the finger of scorn that is pointed at him. But suppose all the outward, and all the inward, shame and misery that are ever visited upon transgression in this life, to be the sinner's portion; still, the "bold bad man" holds in his own hands the duration of his punishment. He may escape from it when he will. He can step, at any moment, into a state of unspeakable happiness. Yes, Judas the traitor,—after betraying, for a miserable pittance, the innocent blood of his blessed Master,—wrung by the agonies of remorse, taunted and scoffed by his base employers, goes out and hangs himself, and so passes to his everlasting joy and rest; while his fellow-disciples have many a weary year to spend in the faithful prosecution of their arduous mission, before a fiery martyrdom shall introduce them to the same blissful state.

There is danger of miscalculating the goodness of God. He is indeed good, merciful, gracious; he is love itself. He is also a holy and righteous being. His highest love, his approbation, his complacent regard can be bestowed

only on goodness, and goodness is the fruit of faithful endeavor and diligent self-cultivation. Glory, honor and immortality are declared to be the reward of those, who seek them "by patient continuance in well-doing." All the promises of God are to be understood as addressed to those, who place themselves in an attitude of obedience and conformity to his will. He is continually holding out to man his supreme good, and urging him, by all the persuasions of infinite love, to come and take it. Man may at any time receive it, and retain it forever. If he wander from it, there is no obstacle to his return but his own perverseness. But the love of God bears no resemblance to the injudicious fondness of a weak parent. He will not make men happy irrespectively of character. He will not force goodness upon them. They can, if they will, despise his offers, and persist in rebellion to his will, and no miraculous hand will be stretched out to save them, in spite of themselves, from the lot they have chosen. C. P.

ART. V. — BRIGGS'S DISCOURSES.*

It is unusual, and may be deemed incompatible with a severely correct taste, to affix to a volume of sermons an inscription so fanciful as that which Mr. Briggs has chosen. The book, however, as we are informed, was thought to require some title, descriptive of the general character of its contents — for all the discourses have an affinity of sentiment and purpose. To find a suitable name, sufficiently concise, and at the same time comprehensive, was a task of some difficulty. Several that suggested themselves as appropriate had been pre-occupied. The beautiful volume of Greenwood, on kindred topics, had already obtained a wide and affectionate welcome, under the simple appellation, "Sermons of Consolation;" and other favorite companions of the Christian in the closet and the chamber of

* *The Bow in the Cloud: Fifteen Discourses.* By GEORGE WARE BRIGGS, Junior Minister of the First Church in Plymouth, Mass. Boston: J. Dowe. 1846. 12mo. pp. 216.

mourning, had associated themselves with familiar names, which it would have been unbecoming to have borrowed.

In this dilemma, the present title — which had previously been adopted for the third of the Discourses, now entitled “The Sign of Promise” — was recommended to the author, as, upon the whole, the most significant, simple and attractive, that could be obtained for the book itself. If a plainer could have been found, it would have suited us better. But if only an emblematical title would answer, it would not be easy to select another more characteristic, or less objectionable, than “The Bow in the Cloud.”

It suggests, at once, the nature of the topics treated in the Discourses, and the character of the views and sentiments presented in them. It leads the reader to look for representations of life's vicissitudes and trials, relieved by bright pictures of the “sweet uses of adversity,” and the triumphs of Christian virtue. It points to the cloudy background of sorrow, illumined and spanned with the arc of promise. It prepares us to meditate on death, and bereavement, and blighted hopes, in connexion with the precious consolations of faith, and cheering assurances of immortality. It promises an exposition, so far as the author's experience and reflection may qualify him to give it, of the sublime Christian doctrines, that God chasteneth in love, and that they who mourn are blessed.

These subjects, which are suggested by the title, and which, certainly, are amongst the most interesting and important that come within the range of the pulpit, are discussed by Mr. Briggs with more than ordinary ability and spirit. We feel, at once, on opening the volume, that we are brought into contact with an earnest mind and a glowing heart, — with a mind that thinks for itself, and a heart that has deeply felt, alike the chastisement of sorrow and the healing power of Christian faith. We are wearied with no dulness; we are vexed with nothing commonplace. The current of thought is invariably full and rapid; running on from the beginning to the end of each sermon with unexhausted strength, and bearing us along with it, without any sense of fatigue, or any suspension of interest. Nothing like artificial method is apparent; although there is no confusion, nor incoherency of thought. The writer has, manifestly, bestowed no study upon the arrangement

of his ideas ; nor sought the help which may be derived from a formal division ; but has, rather, allowed a full mind and heart to pour out their thoughts and feelings, in a natural order and sequence, and with the unity that necessarily results from a strong and warm conception of the distinct subject to be unfolded, and the specific impression to be produced.

Judged, however, by the standard rules for the composition of sermons, and analyzed by an exact criticism, the volume is not without defects. When tested, as works of art, by comparison with the most approved models in their department, these Discourses are by no means perfect. In saying this, however, we would not be understood as considering the sermons before us to be open to severer criticism than many others, which hold a high rank in the catalogue of publications of this sort, and which obtain a wide circulation. On the contrary, it is our opinion that there are few volumes of religious discourses which possess a greater variety of merit, or exhibit more decided marks of genius. All we mean is, to express an exalted estimate of the master-pieces of the great art in question. We do not intend to depreciate "*The Bow in the Cloud,*" but to do justice to our idea of a perfect sermon. We would never suffer this idea to be lowered, either in thought or in word. We would let slip no favorable opportunity of elevating it. We would allow no friendly feelings, no personal considerations, to prevent us from exalting it by contrast, or making it clearer by candid criticism. At whatever cost, *that* must never, for one instant, be clouded, never, in the least degree, be let down.

Our hope for the influence and advancement of the pulpit is dependent, in no small measure, upon this very thing. Let the preacher keep in view, in the composition of his sermons — at least, of those which are intended for publication — the most faultless models. Let him regard sermon-writing as an art, one of the highest arts. Let him do full justice to it, at least in his idea. Let him consider it as inferior to no other. Let him feel that it demands the exertion of all his highest faculties ; that it affords scope for all his genius, all his study, all his knowledge, all his taste ; for the play of imagination ; for the expression of the most delicate shades of sentiment ; for the

exhibition of the utmost artistical skill. This is the true view of it, whatever men in general may say. Whatever crude notions may prevail, or however poorly it may be exemplified in the practice of the clerical profession itself, this is the true view of it. At least it should be the preacher's own view.

It is not to be disputed, indeed, that there is some foundation for the common prejudice against sermons, — that they are proverbial for dulness. We allow that there is some justification of the contemptuous remark, which is so often heard — and which is made as if men felt it a peculiar pleasure, and thought it an indication of superior sense, to decry this class of writings — “O, we never read sermons.” Nor can we wonder, or complain, that so many volumes in this department of composition are rotting in garrets, and on the shelves of old libraries, whose contents are explored only by the moth and the worm. Although we have not a doubt, that there might oftentimes be found within those unopened covers, labeled with their unpromising titles, not only the fruits of deep reflection, of large experience, of superior wisdom, of profound and varied knowledge, not only the fragrant memorials of a sublime piety and an unfeigned benevolence; but also fragments, at least, of the highest eloquence, fair specimens of a pure and noble style, and many passages, which if they were brought into the light, and the unmerited stigma of their origin were concealed, would be universally admired by men of taste, and receive even from logicians and rhetoricians the highest meed of praise.

Besides, we are not willing to allow it to be a fact, that the stupidity and anility of former ages have embalmed themselves, so much more frequently and largely than elsewhere, in those “dumpy little quartos” entitled Sermons, which are packed away in unexplored alcoves of public libraries, like ranges of mummy cases in dark catacombs. Nor do we regard it as by any means so clearly demonstrated, as to be admitted without discussion, that there may not be found, in proportion to their respective quantities, quite as much (and even more) of dry, and unprofitable reading in every other branch of literature, as in this. Moreover, we have often thought that many of those youths and maidens who scout and hide the volumes of Sermons,

which their fathers and mothers loved and revered — whilst they gathered from them food for their sweetest meditations and strength for their worthiest toils — have sometimes rejected therewith more wholesome, aye, and more savory fare for mind and heart, than could be found, after long searching, in whole heaps of the ornamented trash that commands the modern market.

But however this may be, it should be regarded by the preacher himself as a point of professional honor, a principle of professional duty, to countenance no injustice, from whatever source it may be offered ; to admit no insult, by whatever authority it may be sanctioned ; to smile at no superficial sneers, however popular, directed against either his peculiar department of literary art, or the collective works of his predecessors and his contemporaries, who have cultivated, and are exercising it. He knows, or he ought to know — whatever he can do himself — that there is no species of composition, which admits of more grandeur, impressiveness, and beauty, than the sermon ; or which can occupy a higher rank. He knows that there is nothing inherent in the nature of the themes which it discusses, or in the canons which regulate and control their treatment, that necessarily renders the sermon uninteresting, heavy, dry, or inelegant. He knows that its subjects are the most interesting and sublime that can occupy the thought, or inspire the pen of man ; — that all the heart, and all the life, all the inner and the outer world of humanity ; the wide realm of nature ; the whole circle of the sciences ; the crowded history of the past ; the perfections, revelations, laws and operations of God ; the miraculous manifestation of the Deity in Christ ; with all the spiritual glories and moral charms of the character of Jesus ; all that is lovely and wonderful in his life, and venerable and heart-moving in his death, and consolatory and inspiriting in his resurrection and his promises ; heaven and hell ; time and eternity ; that all these, and whatever else affects the interests, or concerns the destiny, or occupies the profoundest thoughts, or kindles the highest imaginings, or stirs the deepest affections of man, come within the range of the pulpit, and may be made tributary to the interest, the instructiveness, the splendor, the majesty, and the power of the sermon. He knows, moreover, or he ought to know,

that — although no preacher among the living, or the dead, has reached the highest conceivable point of excellence in this species of composition — there have been many, in every age of the Church, even amongst those whose works are, through ignorance, set aside as unreadable and included in the sweeping condemnation of dulness, who have discoursed eloquently, and reasoned profoundly, and written beautifully, and whose literary merits, to speak of no other claims, are not a whit inferior to those of the best scholars and writers of the periods which they have enlightened and adorned.

All this the modern preacher knows, or ought to know. If he does not know it, he can have little, very little professional spirit. He has a most unworthy conception of the dignity and power, the reach and the claims of the sermon. Nor can he have conversed with those divines of old, whom to read is to admire, to understand is to be wise, to equal is to be great, and to excel will task, to the utmost, the energies of the most studious and the most gifted mind. All this he knows. And with such knowledge, he cannot think meanly of his peculiar department of art. He cannot listen, unmoved, to the shallow, wholesale sneers of those, with whom it is the fashion complacently to ridicule a whole class of writings, of whose real merits they are incompetent to judge, and concerning the individual portions of which, with but few exceptions, they are utterly ignorant. And, moreover, what he may, from necessity, fail to do in his own practice, he will never forbear to attempt to do by the free expression of his earnest convictions, — to secure for the sermon its just and legitimate literary rank.

Entertaining these opinions, it is certainly an evidence of the high esteem in which we hold the Discourses of Mr. Briggs, that they tempt us to compare them with the best models. There are innumerable sermons, in regard to which it would be almost ridiculous to institute such a comparison. They have their merits and their defects; but they are, obviously, so far below the highest standard of criticism, that one would never think of applying it to them. We pass judgment upon them *per se*; or we measure them with others of their own cast, and which are somewhere near their own level. But the sermons before

us come near enough to those which occupy the first rank, to be estimated by the same rules. In several particulars they will compare honorably with the best. Few are their superiors in freshness, elevation and delicacy of sentiment, in earnestness, animation and fluency of style, in freedom and fervor of thought. Few are more impregnated with the spirit of a cheerful and affectionate piety.

But in all respects we cannot commend them so highly. Their style appears somewhat deficient in dignity, accuracy, and purity—those solid graces of the written sermon—the prominent characteristics of those of Buckminster and Channing. Their earnestness is a little too impassioned, exclamatory and unvaried. It might be equally as profound and impressive with a calmer movement, or if its fervent expression were occasionally intermitted. As an illustration of the reality of the defect to which we here allude, it may not be deemed too trifling to mention the fact, that, being struck with the frequency of the occurrence of the interjection *ah!* we were led to count the number of times it appeared in the sermon which we were then reading, and found it to be no less than eleven. A fervid utterance is natural to glowing thought, and both are immeasurably preferable to tameness and coldness. But when we turn over page after page, and find in every sermon, and in each separate sermon from beginning to end, scarce any perceptible variation of the temperature of thought; when nearly every paragraph, from the exordium to the peroration, appears to have been written under an equal excitement; when we discover no gradual kindling and no temporary lulls of emotion; no letting down, no unstraining of feeling;—though we may admire the ardor that can sustain itself so long and so well, though we may wonder at the fervor which is capable of protracting so elevated a strain, we cannot but sigh for an occasional change of modulation, and feel the want of more frequent opportunities of comparative repose.

We have been somewhat similarly affected by the splendid sermons of Martineau, entitled, “*Endeavors after the Christian Life.*” While reading them, we feel as if we must often pause and take breath. Replete as they are with profound thoughts and resplendent with genius, we miss in them that grandeur which would have been

imparted to them by greater simplicity. If they had been less highly wrought, they would have been more dignified, impressive and truly beautiful. The same impression was, to a less extent, produced by the first sermons of Dr. Dewey; whose more recent discourses, with no diminution of fervor, have gained, essentially, in variety, purity and strength of style.

There appears, among some writers of the present day, to be a dread of nothing so much as of simplicity of language and sedateness of style. They mistake intellectual excitement, for intellectual power; ardor of imagination, for energy of thought; intenseness, for genius; what is extraordinary, for what is original and profound; that which is striking, for that which is effective; that which is highly wrought, for that which is really beautiful. Truth in a plain garb seems to them mere commonplace; and thought proceeding with sobriety of movement, is synonymous with dulness. We do not intend to apply this censure to the author of "The Bow in the Cloud," or to either of the distinguished writers whom we have named; although we will honestly say, that there is something in the style of Mr. Briggs, that has reminded us of the fault to which we refer. His sermons appear to us a little more highly colored than is consistent with a perfectly pure taste. They strike us as being somewhat too sentimental. They would please us more, with more manly directness. They abound in metaphors; which are in most instances appropriate and beautiful, but occasionally faulty; as, for example, in the following sentence. "The festival is kept, when the *consoling hand of the doctrine* it impresses is not only wiping away the tears of bereavement from weeping eyes, but when its sanctifying influence is transforming human hearts." It would be a stretch of his license in a poet, to employ such a figure as this. We cannot think it allowable in prose; or, if the writer considered it lawful and necessary to use so bold a metaphor, he should, at least, have been careful to relieve its singularity and correct the construction of the sentence, by giving a different position to the words "not only," which, as they stand, lead us to look, in vain, for some other operation of the hand besides wiping away the tears. We are happy to say, however, that such instances

as this are extremely rare, amidst a profusion of tropical expressions and similies, with which the most exact taste could find no fault.

We have already made the remark, that the style of these discourses is not altogether accurate; and, therefore, (as we have a strong dislike for all wholesale criticisms — often really unjust, and always exposed to the suspicion of being so,) we deem it imperative upon us, in this connexion, to substantiate its correctness. We will specify, particularly, two grammatical inaccuracies, which occur more frequently than we should have expected in compositions possessing, in other respects, so much merit.

One of these is the omission of the relative pronoun, in cases where its use is indispensable to a correct construction, and almost to the clear understanding of a sentence. The following are selected from a multitude of examples.

“And the sublime devotion of his soul covered his whole form, and his every feature, with a calm, divine majesty, the wondering disciples could only behold with a trembling reverence and awe.” — p. 12.

“For somehow from its change, or its toil, its agonies and tears, if these may be appointed, a blessing is designed to be unfolded, the glories of the unseen world not now so truly bestow.” — p. 117.

“When shall we learn that he who would inherit the bright joys of pure affections in immortal scenes, must drink most deeply of the cup of joy all true unions of the heart may here offer to his lips!” — p. 149.

“What are they to satisfy the infinite desire of a nature, only the infinite love of God can soothe to an abiding peace?” — p. 196.

The other grammatical inaccuracy to which we referred, is a confusion of moods and tenses in the same period. The subjoined instances are enough to show that we are not hypercritical.

“And when he *utters* the simple words, ‘I am he,’ even the rude soldiery *fell* backward, overpowered, awed for the moment, by the majestic calmness of his presence.” — p. 10.

“Cruelty itself *shudders* at the thought of such intolerable pains, and *endeavored* to give a partial relief.” — p. 24.

“Do we not know that the law *demanding* toil on earth, and thus *brings* forth energy and might in man is a glorious proof of his Father’s love. — p. 33.

"For in a world where the angel and the worm alike are messengers of the Father's will, agents to accomplish His eternal purpose, I suppose the soul *may* never fully understand the mission of the minutest fact, until all its relations *should* be seen as they appear to the mind of God." — p. 66.

These are blemishes which a little care would have prevented. They are by no means trifling in such discourses as these. The smallest speck is noticeable on a fair brow, the least defect conspicuous in a fine painting. If a second edition of "The Bow in the Cloud" should be demanded — and we hope, and expect that such will be the case — we shall trust to find in it no such hindrances to the pleasure and comfort of its readers.

Having spoken thus plainly of the imperfections of the volume before us, and given several illustrations of them, it becomes a duty — and it is one which we take pleasure in performing — to present to our readers such specimens as the limits of this article will allow us to transcribe, of the finer qualities both of style and sentiment to which we have previously alluded.

The following eloquent paragraphs are from the sermon entitled "The Peace of God."

"It is true to the experience of every deeply tried heart perhaps, that some hours of wonderful calmness are known, even amid the keenest feeling of its trial. They come, like the deliverance of the disciples tossed in the midst of the sea of Galilee. Immediately, when Jesus entered the ship, it was at the land whither they went. And an inward composure occasionally appears almost as suddenly, in the intervals amid the hours of deepest agitation, in the saddest experiences of life. It is because a mighty trial often most effectually stills every anxiety, that such intervals of composure, as we say, strangely come. How surely these deeper experiences silence for the time the whole crowd of smaller anxieties and fears, often disturbing the whole of ordinary life! Then their clamor can no more be heard. We are taken as by force into a sphere of thought they cannot enter. The busy world, whose every pulse we have hitherto felt in every vein, lies then before the mind, as the great city before the eye, when the Sabbath has brought a stillness over all its bustle and confusion, and every hammer sleeps by the side of the work it has been framing. We are left alone with a towering calamity which instantly dispels all thought of our own strength, and brings us in absolute dependence unto God. The friend, the child, stands on the brink of

the grave, or is laid within it. We cannot but cry unto God. Even Atheism then must pray. We go in sincerity to the Father's throne. And when we ask *thus*, we must always receive. The greatness of the trial, showing our own nothingness, leads to that absolute trust, whose fruit is peace." — pp. 207, 208.

* * * * *

"Let the feeling of entire dependence, the parent of an absolute trust, once be lost from the heart, and it sinks like the faithless Apostle beneath the wave. So have you seen the lake whose surface was entirely undisturbed, reflecting back in almost its original brightness the beauty and the hues of heaven. But when one breath of wind passes over it, a breath so gentle that it may scarcely be felt upon the cheek, in the moment you are gazing, all is gone. Thus does the soul lie open to the direct influence of the Father. He is bending over it with a glory, and a smile of love, that to the spiritual eye seems faintly imaged in the fairest scenes of nature's beauty. Let the heart be still. No disturbing breath must trouble even the surface of the deep sea of its deep affections. Let it lie in an absolute repose from its vain anxieties, and the light of God's countenance shall shine down into its profoundest depths." — p. 210.

One of the most attractive and impressive discourses in the volume is that on "The Death of the Young." We can easily conceive that it was prepared under the immediate impressions produced by the early departure of some lovely child from the parish, or perhaps even from the home of the preacher. We can imagine that the beautiful thoughts embodied in the quotation we are about to make, were actually suggested, and perhaps first uttered, in low and gentle tones of consolation, in the bosom of a bereaved family, contemplating, with their pastor, the fair countenance of the "early called," "sealed with the signet-ring of heaven;" while the morning sun was shining brightly, and all nature was radiant and tuneful with joy, and light and gladness seemed circulating everywhere, save only in that darkened chamber, and in the hearts of that sorrowing company.

"What blessed invitations to trust are spread out before our eyes! What invitations are coming in gracious words to the soul! How calmly nature looks upon the scene, when men are passing away! Who hath not seen her moon walking in brightness when the young and beautiful were departing, and the tide of joyous life was fast ebbing into the sea of eternity? Or who

hath not seen her sun in its rising beauty, or noonday glory, as the last sand of earthly existence fell? And who that witnessed it, hath not felt for the moment an added pang, through the contrast between the brightness of the world without, and the gloom of the clouded mind. Yet why *should* not the sun shine brightly still, and nature put on her garments of beauty? For a deeper reflection tells us no law can be violated; that is to say, no blessed design of providence can be hindered, when these early graves are filled. Why should not the unclouded light of heaven fall upon the tomb, where the early dead are resting? For it is a fitting expression of the true lesson of the providence we are witnessing. Nature smiles over the grave, as around the unbroken circles of human affection. No star is lost from the sky. No ray of light fails. The song of birds doth not cease. All the works of God are the same. Every thing blooms as before, though we are fallen from peace. Whatever is passive to the will of God remains unchanged. Only in man's soul it is dark. Is it not a sweet expression of the lesson of an equal trust to the human heart, descending from the heavens, ascending from the earth, in unnumbered forms? Does it not seem to say, God designs to besiege the soul by this all-encompassing host of His ministering spirits, until it should [shall] surrender its every thought of gloom?" — pp. 118 – 120.

There are many portions of the Discourses which are no less beautiful than these. No one who is suffering from the pangs of bereavement, or bowed down under the burden of trial and misfortune, can read them without being strengthened and consoled, without receiving new light upon the dark ways of Providence, and precious lessons for the improvement of adversity. We know not where to find a more distinct, thorough and able exposition of the true Christian doctrines concerning "Death," and "Sorrow," and "the Law of Consolation," and "the Sources of Peace." These are unfolded by various illustrations, and carried out into numerous applications. Indeed, their development and enforcement form the main design which runs through, and connects together all the discourses. And these doctrines are deduced from the example of Jesus, as well as from the words of the Gospel.

Death is represented as a provision of love, which should be regarded by the child of God as wearing the "same aspect of benignant grace that beams from every other law of His hand." It is not viewed as that mighty change in the very nature of our being, which some imagine it to be.

“According to Christianity, life and death are twin children of the same love. Present being and future being are only different parts of one whole. And between those parts, death scarcely interposes any seam. Life in all its periods is as one unbroken stream; growing wider, deeper, more beautiful, if you please — flowing at length amid fields of ‘living green’ and ‘never withering flowers.’ Yet still the stream is one. Only in part of its course it flows before our view, and in part beyond it. In both states we are in the same temple. In the one case, we are in the outer court, and in the other, in the holy place, perhaps lifting the veil before the holy of holies.” And yet with the most cheering views of death, our author does not countenance the neglect of deep meditation concerning it, or the utter banishment of those sorrowful emotions which it naturally excites in the kind and loving heart. “We are to linger rather amidst these solemn thoughts, and even the griefs they bring. No blessing comes from the mourning, if we bury it in oblivion. Turn not away from the grave where the beloved are buried. Though it instantly fill the eyes with tears to look thereon, go and weep *there*. It is not nature to turn away. It is not wisdom. Go and embalm the memory of the lost in the unchanging, the fragrant affections of the human heart.”

Sorrow, is, in like manner, represented as the wholesome, necessary discipline, appointed by a Father to purify and enrich and ennoble the nature of His children. “Do we not know that the Providence appointing the cross to all who have aught within the heart which needs a crucifixion, is the special token of His eternal benignity?” “In the depths of profound affliction, we are to find the springs of the heart’s purest affections, the fathomless capacities of human love, and through the revelation of them, the revelation also of the Infinite Source whence alone they have their birth.” Suffering is to be endured, not shunned, “as one of God’s ministering angels, always present in earthly scenes.” From the trial itself is to be drawn the balm of healing for the heart, and not aside from it. We should desire no false solace to beguile us, no superficial diversion from our grief. We should commune with our sorrows till they have unveiled to us the high messages they are commissioned to bring to the heart that has faith in Him,

whose errands they perform, and patience and submission to listen, and learn the lessons of His love.

"The law of consolation," we are taught, is, that the "habitually obedient and prepared life" alone, can fill the heart with resources of comfort and ministers of strength for the exigencies of existence and the hours of agony; that we cannot receive and comprehend at once the sublime and blessed truths, that give solace and refreshment to the soul in the night of its trial, but must *grow* into the knowledge of them. We must enter into their holy life and light, through the door and the pathway of living experience. "We may seek to impart some bright view of Providence, to a soul never moved by any deep spirit of trust and love. It is like an expectation that one may see the glorious prospect from the mountain's top, when he is still sitting in the caves of the earth. It is long, indeed, before the *believing* heart penetrates to the deeper treasures of strength and consolation in the truths to which it clings. It is long before the heart can become their fixed dwelling-place, their home." "And if the familiar faith conceal so long its deepest teachings, what can these *stranger thoughts* do to bless us?" "In the midnight of trial we must not expect that the lamp of trust will brightly burn, if the heart have lived in darkness in the prevailing spirit of its life, and been habitually untrustful before."

Lastly, the doctrine of these Discourses concerning "the way of peace" is, that it is the way of an "absolute trust." "It is not to be sought through any processes of argument the understanding may devise concerning the love of God, though they be based upon proofs radiant as the sun and numberless as the stars. It is to be found in the submission of the will, ceasing to question or to speculate. It is found in a filial temper. It is found in a spirit of unquestioning love. The descending of the angel into the garden to strengthen Jesus, images the thoughts of peace, naturally coming in darkest hours, when the heart can say, in simple trust, 'Thy will be done.'"

Such is a brief analysis of the principal doctrines which are developed in these Discourses. They are indeed great and exceedingly precious doctrines; the hardest lessons, perhaps, for the human heart to learn; the constant study of the Christian; whose deepest meaning cannot be wholly

comprehended by any one, who cannot also thoroughly comprehend the spirit and character of Jesus; and whose exposition, whenever it is given so earnestly, and so freshly from the experience and the heart, as it is in "The Bow in the Cloud," cannot be otherwise than welcome, interesting and valuable, to all who are seeking after, or advancing in, the path of eternal life.

C. R.

ART. VI. — DOUBTS CONCERNING THE BATTLE OF
BUNKER'S HILL.

ADDRESSED TO THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC.

DEAR BRETHREN, — I address you by the appellation of *brethren*, for, as a man of the world, I wish to set an example of friendship and charity, in which Christian sects are too often wanting; and besides, as no unbeliever with whom I am acquainted is satisfied with his present opinions, and as we are at all times liable to give up the opinions we now hold, and to embrace something more consoling in the hour of affliction, I am not disposed to be more exclusive without faith, than some professed Christians are with it.

You profess to be believers in Christianity; and I have no reason to doubt your sincerity. But while I accord to you sincerity and honesty of purpose, you will agree with me, that faith and sight are two different things, and that the fact that we are fallible beings, should teach us that we are not infallible in all our speculations.

Man is naturally a credulous being. The bump of marvellousness is so fully developed in this race of ours, that the great mass of mankind are prepared to believe any story, which has a degree of mystery connected with it; and especially if the tale has come down from ancient times, or the scene is laid in a distant part of the world. It is a striking fact in relation to belief, that the object of belief must be a little extraordinary. And it matters not for what the person or event is distinguished, provided it be something out of the usual course.

I know I shall be met with the declaration, that man is a combative being, and that what is advanced or believed by one, will be assailed by another, and hence error is sure to be put down. I readily admit the position, but I deny the inference altogether. Error grows in the midst of controversy. So anxious are controversialists to fall upon others, that when a new theory is advanced, they seldom take the trouble to examine the theory itself, but content themselves with attacking some immaterial point; or they fall out upon some verbal criticism, or question of construction, thus suffering what in parliamentary language is called the "main question," to pass without debate as a sort of admitted truth. In this way many a theory grows up, and claims prescription for its support, while its friends and enemies are contending about some collateral question.

It is also manifest, that if a doctrine be permitted to grow up, even if this permission arise from the fact of its insignificance or absurdity, those who have been its abettors, dupes, or victims if it were possible, will adhere to it from a sense of pride, or even shame. A man deceived at an insignificant show, will pretend that is worthy of public patronage, that he may draw others into the same ridiculous position with himself; for no one likes to be the sole victim of a cheat.

I have made these remarks, to show the natural propensity in man to believe something, his unwillingness to abandon any opinion however hastily formed, and the great danger there is in believing what will not stand the test of close examination. I cannot perhaps better illustrate these principles than by selecting a case from the midst of us, and one too which has now become a subject of general, I had almost said, of universal belief. I allude to the Battle of Bunker's Hill. There is scarcely a man, woman, or child, who doubts the fact of that battle; and yet, if they were called upon for the ground of their faith, they would be compelled to admit that they believe it, because others do; that is, because such a belief is *fashionable*. They believe it, because others do; and would just as readily disbelieve it, if the tide of opinion set the other way. They believe it on the same principle that the Mahometans believe in the Koran, not because they know

anything of the evidence on which their belief rests, but because they have never heard it called in question.

You may perhaps be startled at the idea of rejecting what is so generally believed, and is so intimately connected with the history and glory of our country, as the Battle of Bunker's Hill is supposed to be. But I would ask, whether the glory of the country rests upon facts, or falsehoods. I have no desire to disturb what may be called the hallowed associations which cluster around that spot, but a faithful inquirer after truth should take nothing for granted; but should be governed by the weight of evidence, to whatever conclusions it may lead him. I am no more bound to believe in that battle, because such a belief is general, than I am to believe in any other popular error. If it be a fact that such a battle was ever fought, let it be proved; and if it be not a fact, the sooner it is discarded, the better for the honor of our country. The Romans, for ages, supposed that the glory of their country required a belief in the ridiculous story of Romulus and Remus being nursed by a wolf; but where is the sober man at the present day, who gives any credit to that idle tale? All nations have been disposed to rest their glory upon some remarkable exploit of their citizens, or some special interposition of Providence. On this principle our own people are disposed to recur to the battle of Bunker's Hill, and have regarded it as an event fully sustained by proof—a sort of “fixed fact.” This principle is so riveted into the minds of our people, has so fastened itself upon the wisest and ablest of them, that the great “expounder of the Constitution,” when vindicating the character of Massachusetts, appeared to think that a reference to this battle-field would establish the patriotism of his adopted State. “There is Concord, and Lexington, and *Bunker's Hill*—and there they will remain forever.”

Now, is it not by uses such as these, more than by any positive proof, that the belief in that battle is sustained? Is there not a degree of local or State pride, which greatly strengthens this faith? People always find it convenient to have some admitted principle, some uncontroverted position, some foregone conclusion, to which they can recur at a moment's warning in any emergency. Such is the Battle of Bunker's Hill. Read the political addresses,

and the Fourth of July orations, and you will find that Bunker's Hill is an essential ingredient — as indispensably necessary as the Heathen gods are to ancient poetry. This labor-saving principle, which takes things for granted, and uses them without the disagreeable task of proving them, has been the source of most of the errors in the world. And may we not ascribe the general belief in this battle to the same principle? It is also very difficult to correct any long established opinion, and especially if the belief be general, however feeble the evidence on which it rests. So strongly inclined are most people to cherish preconceived opinions, especially when these coincide with their wishes or interests, that they will hardly yield to any authority, however decisive.

I fear therefore, that I may not be able to convince the public, that the battle in question is a mere fiction. But I will discharge my duty, whether the people will hear or forbear. Those of you who admit the force of reasoning — and those who do not, I despair of convincing; for you cannot reason that *out* of a man, which was never reasoned *in* — will agree with me, that faith, to be valuable, must rest upon evidence; and that before you can consistently call upon a man to believe, you should place sufficient evidence within his reach. Now what evidence have we of the Battle of Bunker's Hill? You will probably appeal to history. But what court of justice would receive mere hearsay evidence? The historians who have written and the poets who have sung of this famous battle, do not pretend that they were eye-witnesses of the scene they describe. There seems to be a kind of sacredness attached to history, to which it is not entitled. What are the elements of history? From what sources do historians gather their facts? Either from tradition, or from some hasty and imperfect accounts published at the time. Now does not every one know, that little or no reliance can be placed upon tradition? And the published accounts are equally uncertain. We naturally receive such accounts with great allowance; and upon flying rumor we place still less reliance. But are these hasty and imperfect accounts, or these rumors, entitled to any more credit after they are embodied in what is called history? If the historian live at the time the event took place, he is as

liable to be biased by prejudice as other men ; and if he live long after the event, he may not possess the best means of information. In either case his authority is of a questionable character. But in this very instance we find that historians differ, and differ too in some very important particulars, as we shall have occasion to show hereafter.

But before we proceed to examine this wonderful page in our country's history, it will be necessary to settle certain principles in relation to evidence. One of the most acute logicians, Mr. Hume, says, " Experience is the only sure guide to reasoning concerning matters of fact. Experience in some things is variable, in others uniform. A variable experience gives rise only to probability ; an uniform experience amounts to proof. Our belief or assurance of any fact from the report of eye-witnesses, is derived from no other principle than experience ; that is, our observation of the veracity of human testimony, and of the usual conformity of facts to the reports of witnesses."

Let us apply these principles of the great metaphysician to the case before us. Many of you, as well as myself, have seen the town of Charlestown, — and what has been our experience concerning it ? Have we seen Bunker's Hill the camp of Mars, and the town in flames ? Nothing like it. We have seen it repeatedly, and have witnessed no such spectacle. Our experience, our uniform experience, leads us to the conclusion that no such battle was ever fought there. Now, according to Mr. Hume, " a uniform experience amounts to proof." We have then proof positive, that Charlestown has never been the scene of blood that has been represented. If we rely upon our own experience, the matter is decided at once ; and decided against the commonly received opinion. And if we take into the account the experience of others, we shall come to nearly the same conclusion. Of our acquaintances more than ninety-nine out of a hundred, who have visited that place, will testify that their experience corresponds entirely with ours. The experience of our acquaintances, then, is as ninety-nine to one against the actual occurrence of the battle. There are, it is true, a few individuals among us, who profess to have been eye-witnesses of the scene which is reported to have occurred on the 17th of June, 1775. But what is our experience in relation to human testimony ?

We know that most men may easily be deceived, and that there are not wanting those who will willingly deceive others. We must bear in mind, that we have the experience of ninety-nine to one against this pretended battle; and that the experience of the ninety-nine is uniform, whereas the experience of the one is variable. The few who profess to have seen the battle, will themselves allow that they have visited this famous spot at other times, and have not beheld anything like what appeared to their vision on that day. Their experience of the battle, therefore, is not only contrary to the experience of others, but contrary to their own experience at all other times. Now by adopting Mr. Hume's system of balancing the different experiences of individuals, we shall find that the weight of experience is altogether against what has been generally believed on this subject.

There are other considerations which go far to weaken the testimony of the few, who pretend to have been eye-witnesses of the scene. They are now old, superannuated men, whose memories are so treacherous that they can scarcely relate the events of yesterday. Surely these are not the most trustworthy witnesses of what took place seventy years ago. But there is another consideration which should not be overlooked. The Battle of Bunker's Hill is a public affair, and such is the degeneracy of the age, that most men think it fair play to cheat the public. Men of honest minds, who would disdain to misrepresent in any case between individuals, will in relation to public affairs testify to what they know to be untrue, without seeming aware that a wrong has been committed. Now the witnesses in favor of the Bunker's Hill affair are thus situated. The testimony, though false, does not injure directly any individual; and they can keep themselves in countenance by saying, that they have not borne false witness against their "neighbor," but have sustained a glorious page in their country's history.

But there are objections to these witnesses of a graver character. They are *interested*, and hence, by every rule of law, are not competent witnesses. Or if it should be said, that their interest is not of such a character as to destroy their competency, it must certainly affect their credibility, and greatly weaken the force of their testimony. For the

last seventy years there has been a sort of charm in this pretended battle, and a kind of glory has seemed to gather around the head of every one who has succeeded in making the public believe, that he was an actor in that scene. This has led many a boasted pretender to assert, that he was one of the choice few who stood forth in defence of liberty on that eventful day — that he was one of those gallant spirits, who “fought, bled, and died on Bunker’s awful mount.” To such excess have the public run upon this subject, that many are desirous of retaining the honor in their family, of having been on that venerated spot during the battle in the loins of their ancestors; hence we frequently meet in the graveyards, among the inscriptions, (which are generally more remarkable for their extravagance and want of truth, than for their modesty or fidelity,) a declaration that the deceased was a “Revolutionary hero,” or that he was “in the battle of Bunker’s Hill.”

Under these circumstances, and with such an enthusiasm of feeling, the testimony of all the pretended actors in that drama must be received with great allowance. But for the last twenty years there has been another, and greater disqualification. Congress has adopted the pension system, a system which in all other countries has exerted a corrupting influence. By this system all who served for a certain period in the war of the Revolution, are entitled to the bounty of the Government. Thus a direct motive has been held out for false witness on this subject. Not that we accuse those of perjury, who have made oath that they were in the battle of Bunker’s Hill. We know the propensity of some men to believe. They will begin with desiring to have been actors in a certain scene; they will soon fancy that they were in some way or other connected with it; they will go on adding little by little, and repeating the tale so often, that at length they will not be able to distinguish between what they saw in early life, and what they have often repeated; and hence, by this progressive faith, will really become believers in their own idle tales. This principle may operate upon some of the witnesses of this pretended battle. Under this system of pensions from the General Government, and gratuities from our State Government, the surest road to honor and profit has been, to be a hero of Bunker’s Hill. It is unnecessary for me to

labor the point, that this direct interest greatly weakens the credibility of the witnesses.

But according to Mr. Hume, when the event itself is improbable, a greater degree of evidence is necessary to sustain it. Now there are on the face of this story many improbabilities. The battle of Bunker's Hill and the burning of Charlestown are to be regarded as one event. We know that by the then existing laws of Great Britain,—which has been denominated the “bulwark of the religion we profess,”—no person was eligible to office, unless he belonged to the Established Church; and is it credible, that a professor of the religion of the meek and lowly Jesus, a religion full of mercy and good fruits, should be guilty of such wanton barbarity as General Gage must have shown, in burning the dwellings of the peaceable inhabitants, and turning the women and children of Charlestown, houseless, into the streets? The manifest inconsistency of such conduct with the character of a professed Christian, compels us to ask for the strongest possible evidence.

But there is another improbability, of greater weight. The Americans are said to have acted under the direction of General Putnam, who from his having served in an earlier war against the French in Canada, must be supposed to have had some knowledge of military operations. Every one who is acquainted with the localities, knows that Charlestown is a peninsula connected with the main land on the west by a narrow belt called “the neck;” and that the place said to be fortified by the Americans with their temporary breast-work, is situated towards the easterly part of the town. Now no experienced General, no man of ordinary military skill, would presume to post his troops in a position so hazardous. He would perceive at once, that the enemy, by crossing Charles river in his boats, and taking possession of the neck and the high land near it, would render their retreat impossible; and thus the whole party would be cut off. It is altogether incredible, that an officer of the reputed talent of General Putnam should have been guilty of such an egregious blunder—such an exposure of his men to certain destruction. But if General Putnam had been guilty of such a stupid arrangement, it is altogether incredible, that a commander of the reputation of General Gage should have failed to avail himself of this

error. He could see from Copp's Hill, at the north end of Boston, and also from Beacon Hill, the exact position of the Americans and the character of their temporary works; and he must have known, that by crossing the river, and taking possession of "the neck" and Bunker's Hill in their rear, the whole body would be completely in his power. But, as the story goes, he embarked his troops at Long Wharf, and landed them near the present Navy Yard in Charlestown, so giving the Americans every opportunity to escape. Now I submit it to any military man to say, whether it is at all probable that General Putnam would have been guilty of so great an oversight, or that the experienced commander of the British forces would have failed to avail himself of such an error of his enemy. Such a series of blunders as the account ascribes to these distinguished commanders, renders the account itself highly suspicious. But admit that the whole story was got up by some person or persons unacquainted with military operations, and the difficulty is solved.

There is also an improbability in the success of this pretended battle. Who can believe, that a few undisciplined troops brought together on a sudden emergency, with poor arms and a very scanty supply of ammunition, could for so long a time withstand the veteran troops of Great Britain, led on by experienced and brave commanders, and supported by the battery on Copp's Hill and by three or four ships of war? There is so much of romance in this page of pretended history, that we are even called upon [to believe, that after the Americans had expended their powder and ball, they sustained themselves for a time by throwing stones at the enemy!

But what is still more conclusive in this case is, that the pretended eye-witnesses of this famous battle differ in some of the most important particulars in relation to the events of that day. Some twenty years ago, when many of the pretended actors in that drama were living, who are now in their graves, an account was published by a distinguished citizen of this Commonwealth, who professed to have been present, and to have commanded a company in that battle. He denied to General Putnam the honor of commanding the troops in person on the Hill, and ascribed that honor to Col. Prescott. This account drew forth a reply from the

friends of General Putnam, accompanied with numerous affidavits of pretended eye-witnesses, declaring that Putnam was present in command upon the Hill during the action. Thus called upon, the author of the account alluded to, procured and published a large number of affidavits sustaining his position, that Putnam was not upon the Hill during the battle. Here we have a striking instance of conflicting testimony from the very persons who professed to have been eye-witnesses, and this difference relates not to some trifling circumstance, but to an essential fact in the history, viz. the name of the commander. Every person acquainted with the history of military exploits, knows that the chief glory of a battle consists in conferring a sort of immortality upon the officer in command. The question, therefore, who commanded on Bunker's Hill, is important, and to men of military sensibility the most important one connected with this whole subject. And yet on this all-important point, the eye-witnesses, though under oath, expressly contradict each other. Who would expect such discrepancy, such flat contradiction, among eye-witnesses? And what confidence can be placed upon testimony of this character? The testimony of one class of these deponents *must* be false, and the testimony of both may be. The question of the existence of the battle itself was not raised during that controversy; if it had been, may we not fairly infer that there would have been as great a contradiction in the testimony in that case as in the other? With men of "military mind" you might as well have no battle at all, as to be in doubt to whom the honor of command belongs. On supposition that the whole story is a fabrication, we can easily account for this conflicting testimony; but if such a battle were ever fought, it seems incredible that there should be a dispute as to the commander, among the officers and men who were in the engagement. But as it is, we have two conflicting accounts, and two heroes claiming the honors of that eventful day.

There is also just that confusion in localities, which we might naturally expect in fiction. It is called the Battle of *Bunker's Hill*, when all the people in that region will tell you, that there never was a battle fought upon Bunker's Hill. Even those who have been so fearful that the whole account would be disbelieved or forgotten, as to attempt

to perpetuate the fiction by the erection of a monument, have virtually confessed that there was no battle on Bunker's Hill, by placing their monument on *Breed's Hill*. Does not this confusion of names and localities cast suspicion over the whole account? When we read the genealogies of the Heathen deities, where similar confusion occurs, we account for it by the fact that the whole is fabulous. Must not the same confusion lead to the same result in this case?

But it may be asked, why such a story should be invented, and how such a general belief should obtain, if the whole is a mere fiction? The same questions might be asked concerning the Heathen mythology, to which I have just alluded; but our inability to answer these questions definitely, does not establish those ridiculous and absurd tales. We may not be able at this late day, seventy years after the event is said to have taken place, to point out the fabricator of this story. But it is sufficient to say, that every age has its own peculiar hobby, and that at that period military exploits were all the rage. There was at that time such a feverish state of the public mind, that any story which went in any degree to cast reproach upon the "regulars," as the British troops were called in common speech, would be readily received by the great mass of the people. Besides, the people of Massachusetts had a strong motive for wishing to excite the sympathy of the other Colonies. The port of Boston was shut up. The town was occupied by British troops, who had committed many outrages upon the inhabitants. Whether Massachusetts should contend single-handed with such a foe, or whether she should enlist the other Colonies in her behalf, was a question of vital consequence to her. May we not, therefore, safely infer, that some knowing one, judging rightly of the effect that such a battle would have upon the Colonies generally, invented this story in order to bring aid from abroad, and to show the people that England was determined to reduce them to vassalage by fire and sword? I do not say that this was the fact; but is there not a strong probability in its favor? May we not fairly infer, that it was a Yankee trick, got up and played off to answer the purpose mentioned above? We know that the report of the battle did arouse the Colonies; and if the story had been invented,

as it answered a good purpose at the time, there would be a strong inducement to keep up the cheat until the close of the war. Nor could the people of Massachusetts, consistently with their interest, abandon the story on the return of peace. Every State was deeply involved in debt, and all were desirous of obtaining all the aid they could from the General Government. The story of the burning of Charlestown, the bravery of the Yankees on the occasion, and the cost of that battle to the Colony, would plead loudly in her behalf; so that, if we admit the account to have been fabricated, there were strong inducements to keep up the delusion.

But perhaps it may be said, that the erection of the monument is sufficient proof of the fact in question. I have no disposition to overlook the monument, or any circumstance which is supposed to bear upon the question before us; but I wish to inquire, how a monument erected on *Breed's Hill* proves that a battle was ever fought on *Bunker's Hill*? If a monument in one place settles the authenticity of the account of a battle in another, why may not this same monument authenticate the account of the battle at Yorktown, or Waterloo? Besides, who would ever refer to image-worship to prove the truth of Christianity? Does not the introduction of symbols of any kind rather show, that the belief in the thing or event represented is on the wane? If there was a full and firm belief that Bunker's Hill had been such a field of glory as has been represented, would there be any need of a pile of granite erected on the spot? The people of Charlestown would naturally feel a pride and an interest in keeping up the impression, that the Revolutionary drama was opened within her borders; and the people in the vicinity, and especially in the city of Boston, would naturally partake of the same feeling; and if they saw that the belief in the oft-told tale of the battle of Bunker's Hill was declining, what is more natural than that they should get up something like the Monument Association, for the purpose of erecting that obelisk which has attracted the gaze of thousands, and gives a sort of notoriety to the place?

The success which attended the erection of that monument, is just what might have been expected on supposition that the whole account of the battle was fabulous. Appli-

cation was made to the Legislature of Massachusetts for aid in its erection ; but with all the local interest which was brought to bear upon the subject, the State did little or nothing in furtherance of the object. Now is it not almost certain, that the patriotic Legislature of the patriotic State of Massachusetts would have contributed largely to that magnificent undertaking, if they had believed that it was commemorative of an event which had actually taken place ? Would a Government which extends its fostering care to pickerel and herring, to woodcocks and the "least wing that flits along the sky," withhold its patronage from an Association whose object was to awaken patriotic emotions, and pay a deserved tribute to the memory of those who hazarded all for their country's good ? Would a State which pours out its treasures like water in aid of every benevolent enterprise, and which encourages science and history by causing a *survey* (for this is the term used by the Legislature) of "bird, beast, fish, insect, what no eye can see"—would such a State suffer such a noble undertaking to linger twenty years, if its citizens really believed that it was designed to commemorate one of the proudest events in our history ? The course pursued by our State Government is altogether inexplicable on any other ground than the one we have suggested,—that great doubts existed whether such a battle was ever fought.

In fact, such was the state of public feeling, (arising from doubts of the truth of this famous exploit, we presume,) that it is very doubtful whether the monument would have been undertaken at all, had not a combination of circumstances favored the commencement of the work. The Masonic institution, which professes to be perfectly *at home* in everything relating to "geometry and architecture," and especially in building in stone and mortar, had not at that time wholly lost its popularity in the State. And availing themselves of the pageantry of that order, the Association for erecting the monument invited the Masons to lay the corner-stone "in due form." One of the most distinguished statesmen and orators of the country was selected to deliver the Address on the occasion ; and the nation's guest, the great and good Lafayette, being at that time in the country, was invited to be present. All these circumstances drew together a vast concourse of people, and gave

an impulse to the undertaking. But it is presumed that few, very few, of those who were present on that occasion, intended by their presence to endorse the account of a battle fought there, half a century before. They wished to see Lafayette and Webster, and to witness the pomp and ceremony of the Masonic institution, with its mystic rites, unintelligible symbols, and "hieroglyphics older than the Nile." It is too great a draft upon human credulity, to ask us to believe, that that vast assembly was a cloud of witnesses in favor of the portion of history under consideration.

The work was commenced under the circumstances we have mentioned ; but when this unnatural, or rather artificial impulse had subsided, and the people came to their sober senses, the work was abandoned, and it stood a half finished monument of the credulity of a people long celebrated for their "notions." Several attempts were made to raise funds sufficient to complete the monument, but with little success. At length, the Mechanic Association, probably more from a desire to show the merchants and wealthy men in the Commonwealth, that they were not behind them in liberality, than from any well founded faith in the event to be commemorated, undertook to finish the structure. But active and persevering as they were, their faith and works both failed them, and the labor upon the monument was again suspended. Now all this is perfectly natural on our hypothesis, but totally irreconcilable with the position that the battle was a reality. It is difficult to believe, that the wealthy merchants of Boston, whose liberality is proverbial, would have suffered this work to linger as it did, if they were satisfied of the reality of the event it proposed to perpetuate. But if the merchants of Boston had for once forgotten themselves, and acted so contrary to their former character, we are confident that nothing but the want of faith could have restrained the intelligent, energetic and noble-spirited mechanics of the Commonwealth, or prevented their finishing that time-enduring work.

As further evidence that real doubts existed, we may mention the fact, that part of the ground, on which the battle was reported to have been fought, was actually sold for building lots. Is it possible, that, if it was really believed so important an event took place on that spot, any part of it could have been alienated for so unworthy a purpose ?

But there was one expedient more to be tried. The ladies, always noted for their credulity as well as for their generosity and untiring zeal, were at last appealed to; and they were imploringly asked to finish what the men had hardly faith enough to begin. They entered upon the work with alacrity; but even the faith and constancy of woman failed, before the cap-stone was brought on with rejoicing. Here the "work of faith and labor of love" were exhausted, and the work would, in all probability, have been abandoned, had not the spirited and energetic contractor, perhaps to save his own reputation, and secure his pay for what he had already done, conceived the plan of levying a tax upon the pilgrims who should resort to this American Mecca. Consequently he provided a steam-engine, (for everything in these galloping days must go by steam,) and the necessary apparatus, by which the pilgrims were raised to the top of this majestic pillar. By the help of this tax he was enabled to complete the monument about twenty years after it was commenced.

Now in view of all the circumstances connected with the erection of this granite pile, have we not reason to suspect, that the public have entertained great doubts of the authenticity of the portion of history under consideration? Or rather is not this great delay inconsistent with a well grounded faith on the part of the people, and perfectly consistent with the hypothesis we have assumed? And now that the monument is completed, the same system of levying contributions upon visitors is kept up, that was adopted by the Catholic priests in the dark ages. Those who ascend this monastic column, walking up its dark winding passage, with a dim light in their hands, must pay a tribute, not of respect to the memory of our fathers, but of money to the guardian goddess of Bunker's Hill.

There are at this time many means resorted to, to keep up the impression that the history of this battle is not fabulous. Besides the tax imposed upon those whom credulity or curiosity may lead to the spot, there is also a sort of Dioramic show of this battle, which has been got up with great ingenuity, and which has been exhibited in various parts of the country, by which the owners are enabled to levy a contribution upon hundreds of those who never visited the battle-field. This is a kind of second edition of

the devices of the Romish Church, by which those who never saw one of their saints when alive, are enabled to see and to possess, if they are able to pay the purchase money, some pretended relic of him when dead.

But the boldest expedient is yet to be mentioned. The **Masons**, it is said, have erected a little monument within the great one, to aid in commemorating the fading glories of this memorable battle. This is drawing upon our credulity in the same manner the Irish monk did upon the traveller, when he showed him two skulls of St. Patrick, the one his skull when he was an adult, the other his skull when he was a boy !

All these influences are brought to bear upon the subject, to keep up the faltering faith in that pretended military exploit. There is also a local interest, a State pride, which fosters this belief. Vermont points to Bennington, New York to White Plains, New Jersey to Princeton, and Virginia to Yorktown, and it is a pity, if Massachusetts cannot divide the glories of the Revolution with her sister States, when she contributed so largely of her blood and treasure to carry on that war. Her efforts in that struggle would justly entitle her to at least one consecrated spot, to which those who have no patriotism themselves can point, and boast of the patriotism of their ancestors. Not that I would call in question the patriotism of our citizens generally ; but it is true of Massachusetts men, as well as others, that those who have the most to say of the heroes of the Revolution, and who point to Bunker's Hill the most frequently, have the least of that self-denying spirit, which characterized our ancestors. Such men could hardly sustain themselves, if Bunker's Hill were blotted from their memory. This local feeling, this State pride, this boast of our father's patriotism, uttered so loudly by those who have none themselves, united with pecuniary interest, serves to keep up a pretended or real belief in the event. And besides, all who have contributed to the erection of the monument, are committed to that belief. For such persons to reject this boasted page in our history, would be confessing either that they had been imposed upon themselves, or that they had endeavored to impose upon others. And the number thus committed is very great ; for I believe, in some cases the subscription was restricted to the small sum

of five dollars as the maximum, on the plea that no one might be deprived of the opportunity of having his name enrolled among those who cherished a grateful remembrance of the deeds of departed heroes. But may not this limited subscription be fairly construed into an admission, that five dollars was the measure of the strongest faith on this subject; and may we not infer that this was a device to enlist as many as possible, so that if this pretended battle should ever be called in question, these subscribers should ever hold their peace?

Taking all these circumstances into view, it is not at all surprising that the great mass of the people should believe, or pretend to believe, in this opening scene of the Revolutionary drama. The mass believe in it, because the belief is fashionable. The superstitious believe in it, because they think it nearly allied to impiety to call it in question. The worldly wise and prudent acquiesce in it, through fear that an agitation of the question would produce excitement. And the unprincipled demagogue adopts it, because he finds Bunker's Hill a convenient watch-word to excite the passions of the ignorant.

I might pursue this subject further, and show other causes which, in the want of sufficient evidence, serve to keep up this belief; but I deem it unnecessary. I have shown on the great principles of Mr. Hume's theory, that the battle of Bunker's Hill is not entitled to our belief; that experience, that great touchstone of truth, is decidedly against it; that the event itself is improbable; that the witnesses in its favor are interested, and that their testimony is contradictory. We have also seen that the tardiness in the erection of the monument furnishes a strong presumptive argument, that those who erected it had but a wavering faith in the event the structure proposed to perpetuate; and that local feeling, personal interest, and State pride will easily account for the general belief we find in the community, even admitting the history of the event to be fabulous.

I do not intend to be dogmatical, but I would respectfully ask whether we have not made out our case. Have we not shown on the theory laid down by Mr. Hume, that the people have been grossly deceived upon this subject? I think we have. We have followed out the reasoning of

the great logician, and are, as it seems to me, compelled to admit, either that the accounts we have read from our childhood of the battle of Bunker's Hill are all a fabrication, or that Hume's great argument is fallacious and his positions false. Here then is the dilemma. And which horn shall we embrace? If we follow Hume, we shall unsettle the faith of thousands, and destroy all confidence in history; and if we adhere to the common opinion of the events of June 17th, 1775, we assail the great logician, draw upon ourselves the charge of being credulous, and are justly exposed to the sneers of all unbelievers. Nay, more; if we reject Hume's theory, we shall be charged with being led by Campbell, and other priests, who, it is said, are interested in keeping up a great reverence for what is called *faith*. If we discard the theory of Hume, we shall be accused of being priest-ridden, and so wanting in manly independence. Moreover, we shall, in such case, be required to believe not only in the battle of Bunker's Hill, but in other events recorded in history. We shall also be compelled to believe in the events recorded in the Scriptures, and to receive the precepts of Christ and his Apostles, which have always been found to be troublesome companions for those of us, who, rejecting Puritanism, wish not only to think, but to act and live freely — that is, to enjoy our "home-bred and fire-side rights."

On a full view of the whole subject, I am inclined to adhere to the theory laid down by Hume, who may be regarded as the father of all rational unbelief. His theory makes short work of miracles and the other dogmas of religion. It is too laborious a task, to refute all the arguments which are brought in support of Christianity, even if it were possible. Who can have patience to plod through Lardner's elaborate "Credibility," or even Paley's "Evidences of Christianity?" Butler's "Analogy" requires more study and thought, than most of us wish to bestow upon that subject. West on the "Resurrection of Christ" is a small book, but is exceedingly difficult to answer; and Littleton on the "Conversion of St. Paul" has so perplexed me, that I have resolved never to attempt to read it again. Leland's "View of Deistical Writers" presents the opinions of our friends in such an awkward light, that I have no patience with it; and even Leslie's "Short and Easy

Method with the Deists," is far too *long* and *hard* for me to answer. Now considering the multiplicity of books in support of Divine revelation, and the great difficulty there is in answering their arguments in detail, I have felt the necessity of some "short and easy method" of meeting these arguments at once; and I find nothing so convenient as Hume's theory. I can answer all these writers, meet all their arguments, and overthrow all their statements, by the talismanic reply of Mr. Hume — *The experience of the world is against it.*

This summary mode of meeting all kinds of troublesome arguments, I have found of great service on innumerable occasions. I therefore cling to it. I regard it as a kind of labor-saving machine, which answers every purpose, and has this additional recommendation, that the superficial can employ it just as well as the profound. I have found it perfectly satisfactory in speculation. I say *in speculation*, for I must confess, that it will not hold good in the common affairs of life. When I first became acquainted with the writings of Mr. Hume, I was so pleased with his theory, that I resolved to make it the rule of my life in the management of my ordinary affairs. But you can hardly conceive of my mortification, when I found this, my favorite theory utterly to fail me. I learned by that very experience which Mr. Hume commends, that his theory led me to doubt everything, to withdraw confidence from every body, and refrain from all action whatever. I found it would paralyze all effort, destroy all business transactions, and produce a sort of Mesmeric sleep in the whole community. My embarrassment was extreme; but I soon extricated myself from this difficulty by adopting a theory of my own concerning Mr. Hume's theory, viz. that his grand position of human experience was *merely theoretical*, — well adapted to matters of speculation, but never designed to apply to the tangibilities of real life.

This view of Mr. Hume's theory, I find exceedingly convenient. I can use it or disuse it, as the case may require. I employ it in all matters of mere opinion, in all abstract speculations, but discard it, or rather lay it aside, in all cases of a practical character. In this way I enjoy all the benefits of his theory without any of its embarrassments. But utility is not the only recommendation of my theory;

it avoids many popular objections. I keep temporals and spirituals entirely separate; and hence can never be accused of designing to unite Church and State. I keep everything in its place, and have appropriate modes of reasoning for each particular department, thus giving to each a portion in due season.

I have thus expressed myself freely, and have given my views without reserve; and I trust that I shall not be discarded for my frankness, or be pronounced an infidel. It is true that I reject revelation, but why should I be denied the Christian name on that account, any more than others?

C. H.

ART. VII. — POETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

I. THE SNOW.

THE snow has come: — o'er field and hill
Its fleecy mantle wide is thrown;
And winter's breezes, stern and chill,
Through leafless branches sadly moan.

Hush'd is the song in every grove,
And fled the warblers far away;
Forgot their spring-told tale of love,
Amid December's ruder lay.

Each little flower, that late so fair
Was mirrored in the passer's eye,
All wither'd lies. — Alas! — the rare,
The beautiful live but to die.

O say not so. — The cold, cold grave
May shut them from our earthly view;
But He, th' All-powerful to save,
Doth point us to their glory too.

Believe each season, as it goes,
A lesson brings for us to know;
Perhaps 't will speak of present woes —
Perchance some future bliss foreshow.

Then hail ! thou wintry robe of white !
Fair messenger of swift decay !
What though thou tell'st of waning light ; —
Thou heraldest a brighter day.

W. V.

II. A PARABLE.

From the German of Frederick Rückert.

BEFORE the Sultan's throne appears
The mewlana, with lowly brow.
"Thy wisdom's fame hath reached mine ears ;
Then answer me one question now.
Four several sects, well knowest thou,
My faithful Mussulmans divide ;
Without delay, then, tell me now,
With which doth Allah's favor side ?
By which of these four pathways, say,
Shall dust attain to Allah's throne ?
In doubt I've waited till this day,
Now let the certainty be known."
The Sultan spake, and waited, dumb.
The mewlana gazed silently
A moment round the audience-room,
And then he said, with bended knee : —
"Thou in whose throne the faithful race
The throne of Heaven reflected see,
Protect me with thy shield of grace,
Then shall my answer be to thee.
Thou sit'st enthroned here in a hall
To which four doors thy slaves admit,
And all thy splendor bursts on all,
Through whichsoe'er they enter it.
That I did not mistake the way,
Thy messenger the praise must claim ;
And, dazzled by the bright display,
I know not, now, which way I came."

C. T. B.

III. INVOCATION.

UNSHEATH thy sword, Orion ! let it flash
Athwart the firmament. Ye Sisters six,
No longer mourn the lost Merope ! Earth —
For love of which she veiled her starry brow,
And faded dimly in the distance — earth
Hath cast her off, and she comes back to heaven.
Stay in your starry course, ye hosts of heaven !
Look upon earth — the bright — the beautiful —
The God-created earth, and quench with tears
The fire which man is kindling. And, O Thou !
Eternal Source of life and light, stretch forth
Thine arm omnipotent — in mercy save
The work of thine own hands. *Man hath gone mad !*
In vain the heralds of thy Son proclaim
Tidings of peace, in vain their hands uplift
The banner of the Cross ! Man heeds them not,
Or heeds them but to scoff. He talks of *war*
As of a pastime ; and, with fiendish joy,
Makes haste to treat his brother as his foe,
And crush with iron heel into the dust
The image of his Maker. Prince of Peace !
Were all thy promises but idle words ?
Was Calvary sprinkled with thy blood in vain ?
Is night still resting on thy sepulchre ?
Father ! our hearts are failing us for fear.
We fly to thee for succor. Lift thou up
The sunlight of thy countenance, and cause
The spirit of thy Son to walk across
The troubled waters ; — then shall all be calm
And hushed to peace. Speed on the day when men,
No longer slaves to ignorance and sin,
Shall learn to war and fight no more ; when earth,
Hallowed in all her borders, shall take up
The angels' song and peal it back to heaven : —
"Glory to God on high ; peace, peace on earth,
Good-will toward man !" O, let thy kingdom come !
For thine the kingdom is, and thine the power,
And to thy name be glory evermore !

IV. THE TREE OF LIFE.

From the German of Rückert.

WHEN Father Adam lay at his last groan,
He sent to Paradise his faithful son,
A twig to fetch him from the Tree of Life,
Whereby he hoped recovery might be won.
Seth plucked the twig and brought it home, but lo!
Our Father's ghost, with his last breath, had flown.
Then planted they the twig on Adam's grave,
And so from son to son 't was handed down.
It grew, when in the pit young Joseph lay, —
When Egypt's taskmasters made Israel groan.
That tree put forth its blossoms fragrantly,
When David, harping, sate upon his throne.
Dry was the tree, when, in his wisdom, erred
From the Lord's way the sage king Solomon.
Yet every generation hoped to see
Its life renewed in David's greater Son.
Faith saw that day, in spirit, when she sate
In sorrow by the floods of Babylon.
And when the eternal lightning flashed from heaven,
Then burst the tree with high exultant tone.
God's grace had chose its withered stock to be
The passion-wood, to stretch his Christ upon.
The blind world hewed its timber to a cross,
And slew, with scorn, its own dear hope thereon.
Then did the tree of life bear bloody fruit,
That whoso tasted, life should be his own.
O Freimund, look ! despite the storms of time,
How high and broad the tree of life hath grown.
Its *shadow* falls e'en now on half the world ;
When shall the whole its grateful *shelter* own !

C. T. B.

ART. VIII.—MEMOIR OF HENRY WARE.*

THE book which has been so earnestly desired, is now in the hands of the many friends of Henry Ware. It has been read and approved. Undoubtedly there may be different opinions as to its execution, though we have heard of few exceptions to the general expression of grateful satisfaction. The book is not an eulogy, and none could wish it to be. It would not have comported with the character of the subject, or the relation of the writer. And this last may have prevented other features, which some would have been glad to see. The delicacy of a brother would naturally temper much of the ardor of expression, which another might have indulged. Yet while the ardor glows in every heart that knew Henry Ware, the very thought of him, in all his meekness and habitual moderation, does of itself forbid us to utter the half of what we feel, and we even thank the biographer that he has left so much unuttered. But all cannot be repressed. We must utter some of our feeling, not only for the man, but also for the Memoir. It does seem to us a most successful effort, and appropriate tribute. This conviction is strengthened by a second perusal. It is precisely the book which one would wish to make for a brother, and such a brother. It is a book, which, we believe, Henry Ware himself, with all his severity of judgment as well as sensitiveness of nature, would approve. Flattery he abhorred, and there is none here. Extravagance he always avoided, and scrupulously has his biographer avoided it, even where it might have been pardoned. But we value the Memoir, yet more, for its usefulness. It will do good—and then will it accomplish the great object, for which he, whom it delineates, lived and labored. The earnest declarations which we have heard, as to the impression it makes, from some not apt to feel or speak thus, the interest it is calculated to awaken in those least familiar with its facts, the high yet reasonable and attainable mark to which it points the young minister, and every Christian believer, the vast results which it gradually exhibits by the very narrative of events, in its calm tone and just

* *Memoir of the Life of Henry Ware, jr.* By his Brother, JOHN WARE, M. D. Boston: Munroe & Co. 1846. 12mo. pp. 484.

measure, satisfy us that it will take the place in the public regard, to which its name entitles it. Beautifully does the life speak, naturally and movingly does the man stand before us, and the whole work seems to us nearer an autobiography, than we supposed it possible for another to make. Some of us, it is true, are interested and partial judges, but the judgment is confirmed by the reception of the book and the common voice, so far as heard.

Leaving that voice to speak for itself, and the book to make its own way, we desire only to enter upon these pages a brief record of a life so important, a character so pure and beloved. This we must be allowed to do without formality, and with little restraint upon feelings so strong as those which a favored intimacy awakened. The leading events of the life are known, but some sketch of them should be found in this journal. We can give no extracts, and if we quote from letters, it will be from some in our own possession not published.

The childhood of Henry Ware was passed in Hingham, where he was born, April 21, 1794. And that childhood was in harmony with the whole life. With nothing precocious or remarkable, he seems to have been always thoughtful and sedate, showing from the first a determination to become a minister, and exercising his gifts in writing and preaching at a very early age. Having been placed for a short time under the tuition of Rev. Dr. Allyn of Duxbury, he removed to Cambridge with the family in 1805, when his father was appointed Hollis Professor in Harvard College. Soon after he lost a mother, who inspired in all her children an affectionate reverence, and left a permanent influence. Though but eleven years of age, he wrote in verse his thoughts and feelings on this event, and shows the effect of it in other allusions at a later period. Continuing his education at Cambridge, and for a year at Andover, he entered Harvard College in 1808, and was known at once, not for great scholarship or striking talent, but for the quiet devotion to duty, the gentle and serious demeanor, and the unaffected piety, which distinguished him through life. In his Senior year he taught a public school in Beverly; and young as he was, entering diffidently upon his first trial in circumstances not the most favorable, he yet made an impression which the writer of

this notice found to be vivid and delightful nine years after, when called to the charge of the same school. Graduating with honor in 1812, he became an Assistant in the Academy at Exeter, beginning at the same time his theological studies, and after two years returning to Cambridge to complete them. In 1815, at the age of 21, he began the work for which he had always longed, and from which his affections were never turned to the end of life, — the work of a minister of the Gospel.

And here we would speak of a prominent trait in the character of Henry Ware. He was strictly and most consistently, by choice, principle, fitness, and unreserved devotion, a *minister*. That which many assume from mingled motives and with various aims, he assumed, or rather accepted, as if no other occupation had ever occurred to him, and no other object could ever divert him. No other ever did. To the ministry first, to the ministry most, to the ministry as above all other claims, he devoted his life. Other objects engaged him, but none inconsistent with this, none that superseded it, or made it even secondary for a moment. Every high and worthy cause awakened his interest, and received some share of his attention, but never to the forgetfulness of his calling, or the neglect of one of its duties. Few men have done more than he for the many social, moral, and philanthropic movements of the day ; yet who has done more for the ministry of the Gospel ? Not only did he carry the spirit of the Gospel into every other work, showing their relation and aiming to extend their reciprocal influence, but he gave himself first and most to the direct work of the ministry itself ; and whether as a preacher, or the former and helper of preachers, he allowed no other object, however worthy or grand, to come into competition with the claim and work of the Gospel. For peace, temperance, freedom, benevolence, education, theology, the spread of the Bible, the influence of the Lyceum, he spoke, and wrote, and labored ; but not a mind in the community, we venture to say, ever identified him with either of these, or forgot, or supposed him to forget, the character and office of the Christian minister. There was a time, and the Memoir discloses some of its trials, when most of his friends feared that one cause, that of the slave, was engrossing too much

of his mind, or might lessen his general influence. But at that very time, he was regarded by those to whom the condition of the slave was the first, if not the only pressing interest, as lukewarm and unfaithful, because of his independent position and higher devotion to the great object of his life. That object was still, and always, the Christian ministry. To this he gave the best service of all his powers. To this he made everything bend. In talking, in reading, in journeying, in health and sickness, labor and rest, his heart seems ever to have turned to this, and his thoughts and prayers were given it when he had nothing else to give. It was affecting to see him, after the springs of life had been touched, and the silver cord was loosed, reviving at the very mention or thought of this work, kindling as he spoke, and pouring out the fervor of his struggling spirit in behalf of the cause for which he still longed to live and labor. It was his life, and it never ceased but with life, or rather ceased not at all, but only changed its sphere. We regard it as the source of his strength, and the secret of a success, which his powers did not lead him, if they did others, to expect. If any think that this intense devotion to his work, so various in its efforts, so unsparing and fatal, should be a warning, let them also reflect, that his unswerving devotion to the supreme object amid all other pursuits, and the singular power it gave him, should at the same time be an example and an encouragement.

In the Memoir, at page eighty-third, there is a remarkable paper, written by Mr. Ware a few months before he began to preach, and marked on the envelope — "To be opened and read for improvement, once a month." It shows a habit of severe self-scrutiny and a sense of deficiency, such as may shame many and animate all. His first preaching was not distinguished, and seems to have left only the impression of a devout and fervent spirit. He soon however received an invitation to settle over the Second Church in Boston, and was ordained the 1st of January, 1817. There he remained nearly thirteen years; and though most of them were marked by weakness, if not illness, and several times he was wholly disabled, it is safe to say, that few ministries of any duration or vigor have witnessed a greater amount of labor, a more entire devotion to spiritual interests, or larger and richer results. There were singular

contrarieties, or at least diversities, in the character and power of his ministry. Naturally inclined to indolence or a sort of self-indulgence, he was an indefatigable and disinterested laborer. With multiform engagements and ceaseless demands upon his time and thought, he was never in haste. No man had more on his hands, no man was more ready to engage in other and all good work. Of calm and often cold exterior, he was ever glowing with tender and intense feeling. We know that some found him repulsive; to us, and to many, he had a power of attraction and impression possessed by very few. We seldom entered or left the presence of Channing, without a sentiment of awe; we seldom entered or left the presence of Ware, without a sentiment of gratitude. Yet there were times when both these sentiments changed places. Both were closely allied, and so were they who caused them. Men more separated by circumstances and habits, with greater unity of spirit and power, do not often meet in the same city and ministry. It was our fortune once to see them brought together in a relation and manner deeply affecting. As we were sitting with Mr. Ware in his desolate room just after the death of his wife, Dr. Channing came in to offer his sympathies. Such a comforter, with such a mourner! Few and calm were the words uttered, deep and delightful the impression left.

Having touched upon the character of the mourner, writing as we feel rather than by method, we may refer to other facts, which help to show him as he was in the family, and as he could not be known to all. Those who knew him only as a public man, or even in private as the professional man, may have little idea of his domestic character. It is one of the few points in which the Memoir can be thought deficient, that it fails to present him fully as the man of sentiment. That he made no display of feeling, is saying little. That he sometimes concealed it, so as to appear almost insensible when his whole soul was melted, we know. His sensitiveness to the power of music and poetry, his love of nature in all her forms and the profound awe he felt at her sublimer aspects, the silent tear that started at the call of humble suffering and of moral heroism, the ready sympathy in both the joys and sorrows of childhood, revealed to intimate observers a nature, which common

appearances seldom asserted and sometimes denied. And there was an intensity of emotion under his own sorrows, together with a calmness and cheerfulness, which disclosed to us as much of the Christian, as all besides. In proportion to the calm depth, was the humility of his grief. Had he a more remarkable trait than his humility at all times? When God's hand was upon him, it was indeed affecting. He did not love to speak of it, but so strong was the feeling, that in some of his letters in seasons of affliction, he would say — 'What must I be, to *need* this chastisement?' When we have stood with him at the bed of his dying boy, and heard the brief, calm, uplifting prayer of more than submission, rising in those tremulous tones, the moment the spirit departed, we have felt a power, which all public demonstrations might have failed to reveal to us. And then the simple and beautiful trust which he shows, not long after, connecting this death with the first that occurred from among the many who met in that joyous family-gathering described in the Memoir (p. 373.) It was a child that went first, and thus he writes in his letter of sympathy. "One can almost fancy that he has been called up to the company of those that were gone before, to tell them all about it: — why might not some one come back to tell us of them, and to say who should be summoned next? There is a goodly number there already, and the new cherub will not find himself amongst strangers. Methinks I see him now, taken by the hand of one of them, *perhaps it is Robert*, and led forward to his place, wondering and happy!"

If children remain children in heaven, we need no fancy, but only faith, to conceive of the welcome which *he* found, when he joined that company above. There was a reality in his connection with children, which should also go to make up a complete idea of the character. We have known no one, who entered more entirely into the happiness of the young, or contributed to it more generously. With the pen, with the tongue, with the joyous song, the humorous sport, the hearty laugh, he became a perfect child, the happiest of the happy. Little poems, droll stories, cunning charades, prodigious and most laughable fancies — there was no limit to the ingenuity, variety, and ease, with which he promoted the joy of the playful hour. And yet

in a manner, which made the power of his moral presence, his smile or soberness, his encouragement or reproof, all the greater. The fountain of his humor, deeper and more gushing than some could imagine, was as pure as it was full. Did ever child or man breathe a word of impurity in his presence? The sportive word was always welcome, when in its place; if out of it, it met a different response. He has somewhere said of himself, that he seldom laughed; but there was a heartiness in his laugh worth a thousand of empty sound. Indeed mirthfulness was a part of his nature. Would that we could show it as it appears in many of his letters, and in some well-remembered scenes; for it goes far to explain to us the power, which his character as a whole, and especially his most unrestrained presence, exerted over us. The verses to Mr. Ingersoll from Port Kent, and a few other passages in the Memoir, intimate something of this, but cannot tell half. Weakness and illness seldom checked, often seemed to quicken, this vein of humor. He indulged it when he could do nothing else, for his own or others' comfort. And again, in his best and busiest hours he gave time and strength to the most juvenile work, such as would gratify or instruct. The original copy of Robert Fowle he *printed* with his own pen, for one of his children; and many other stories of less extent. In a letter written from a sick room, after naming a number of pleasant books he has been reading, showing anything but idleness, he says — "So you see how the lassitude and good-for-nothingness of a sick chamber lead to waste of time;" and then adverting to the plans of labor he had formed and must now postpone, he adds — "I could cry, if I ever cried." We dismiss these little incidents, trivial we will not call them, with an allusion to his Sunday evening instructions of his own children. With the setting sun, he would call them together, and ask each one for a hymn, talk of their Sunday lessons, and encourage them to question him, which they did freely. Then taking a Scripture story, he would tell it in his own language, pointing out the moral, and fixing the attention of the youngest; and as a conclusion, they would all sing a hymn, his rich bass chiming in beautifully with their childish treble.

We have been speaking of character, without reference to time. But the power of such character in a minister, this

ready sympathy with the young and old, the grave and the cheerful, is undoubtedly one explanation of Mr. Ware's unexpected and unusual success in his ministry in Boston. It was there we left him, and so long as he remained there, until prostrated by illness, he was constantly gaining in the confidence and love of all, and in peculiar influence with many. In the last years of his ministry, he is believed to have stood higher in the regard of all classes, and wielded greater power, than any individual in that city. Yet was there never the slightest appearance of adulation on the part of the community, or conscious elevation in himself. A favorite with all, he was the idol of none. We attempt in vain to recal an instance, in which there has been such high reputation and universal acceptance, with so little panegyric. And this itself is the best distinction. To possess a character which commands admiration but repels flattery, to exercise a power in the pulpit which makes every one think of himself and the truth more than of the speaker, to win the tender and confiding affection of many hearts, with such absence of effort and disregard of appearance as to seem to a common observer indifferent and frigid; still more, to do all that he did in all ways, and leave the name he has, with no trait or talent remarkable and prominent to every one, — shows a rare combination of mental and moral powers. His own people felt it deeply. And when his ill health compelled him to ask to be released from duties which he could not discharge, they would not "give him up," but provided a colleague, and relieved him of all care. Soon after, he was appointed Professor in the Theological School at Cambridge, with permission to go abroad for health, and with generous provision by friends at large for all the wants of a traveller. He accordingly sailed for England in April, 1829, and returned in August of the next year, having given these sixteen months to recreation and varied acquisition in different countries of Europe. He enjoyed much, and suffered much. Health and vigor did not come as he hoped, and, under the effect of exhaustion and disappointment, he had seasons of depression unusual for him. No wonder. Far from home, separated wholly from what he so loved — labor and usefulness, with the prospect of going back to a life of lingering weakness and idleness, and many anxieties pertaining to

others, we only marvel that he bore up as he did, that he saw and learned so much, and came home to enter at once upon the arduous duties of an untried place, with high expectations awaiting him, and little strength to meet them.

In the autumn of 1830 he removed to Cambridge, and there spent twelve years in the Professorship of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care. The office was made for the man, and the man for the office. It was the ministry still, and its chief object was the aid of the ministry. Therefore he loved it. He brought to it the results of experience, a furnished and ever active mind, glowing but always tempered zeal, and a full heart. He could not fail of success, and he did not. The voices of those who were under his care, the usefulness of many since, and the unqualified sentiment of the whole denomination, if we may not comprise many more, testify to the fidelity, the arduous labors, and the influence of this period of his life. It was an important period. With the ministry in Boston it makes the whole of his public life, and these two periods, nearly equal, are the marked divisions. How short were they, compared with many other ministries; yet how long do they appear, when measured by the thought of all they accomplished! They covered just a quarter of a century, during which occurred the greatest changes and most important events, by which Unitarian Christians in this country have been effected. And now, in looking back, does the eye discern one figure or agency so inseparable from the whole, so efficient in originating, promoting, and controlling, so relied upon for energy and discretion combined, so busy with pen and voice in every province and good work, and withal so true to his own calling, unobtrusive, quiet, spiritual in his influence, as Henry Ware? This may seem eulogy, and had we not often heard it expressed by others, less partial and better able to judge, we would not say it. But we believe there is no individual, with whom more minds have identified the progress and power of liberal principles, or the prevalence with them of an evangelical spirit. His own spirit was always evangelical, and he breathed it into the minds and ministry of not a few of his pupils, and of his brethren everywhere. The Gospel was his law; he owned no other, he would sanction no other as equal. Christ was to him authority;

to this alone he bowed, and he could ill brook any rival authority, whether of dogmatism or liberalism. With a spirit of independence and charity not easily surpassed, he was unequivocal in the adoption and immoveable in the defence of the word of God, the sufficiency and supremacy of the Gospel of Christ. He frankly advised more than one young man not to preach as a Christian minister, if he could not preach Christ, above all other teachers. Yet who associates narrowness, timidity, or intolerance, with Henry Ware? The most withering rebukes we ever heard him utter, were for the intolerant of his own name. In those of other names, whose faith in some instances seems to require this spirit, he condemned it less, and checked those who were disposed to condemn it loudly; but in his own friends, he could not spare the egregious inconsistency and sin. If he ever forgot his charity in the least, it was in that hardest of all exercises of this virtue, patience with the uncharitable. In regard to the name, the doctrine, the promotion of Unitarian Christianity, he was open, fearless, and most diligent; but we have reason to think, that he felt more, or at least said more, of the faults of his own system, than of any other; while we are sure, he never questioned the piety or did injustice to the merits of any. It was often said, by those who misrepresented alike him and the faith in which he gloried, that he was no Unitarian, as is said of all who are suspected of piety; and we rejoice that they are so many.

The influence that he exerted as a teacher at Cambridge, was spiritual more than theological. His spiritual power was felt, not only in the School, but in the College, where also he had duties; preaching in the Chapel, instructing the undergraduates for a time in Paley and Butler, and inviting them to religious conferences. He attempted indeed to be not a preacher alone, but in some measure a pastor to the University, that he might reach the affections and individual wants of the students, in ways which many suppose impracticable. Yet even this limited and broken effort accomplished enough, to show that something could be done with full strength and the opportunity of perseverance. For him, there was neither strength nor opportunity. A crowd of duties in different departments, such as no man of even iron strength should undertake, engrossed his whole time, and

soon undermined the feeble frame. Again and again had he been brought down, through his whole life, but again and again had rallied and risen. He was never hale, often nerveless; but he worked on, he formed new plans, he engaged in new duties, he aided every good object, he was consulted more than any other man by younger ministers, and applied to by destitute churches, until at last that which had been averted beyond all expectation, came upon him, — he was prostrated, and compelled to resign every trust. In 1842, he left Cambridge with his family, and retired to Framingham, where he lingered in varying health and hope for more than a year, full of plans still, but unable to execute them, alive to the enjoyment of friendship and nature, cherishing fond hopes of action and usefulness, suffering keenly from disease and disappointment, but calm in faith and with bright visions, to the end. The end came on the 22d of September, 1843.

The end! We like not to connect that word with any Christian life, surely not with his. It is one of the lives, with which it is most difficult to associate death in any form. We find ourselves, when we think of him, repeating the words which he once used in expressing his poignant grief at the loss of a loved friend: — “It is a strange feeling, that never lasts; for ordinarily it is just as if she were still living.” We see more of Henry Ware, not less, now that he is gone. That common experience of the power of death to bring out the life and reveal the whole man, is peculiar here. Apart from the spiritual view, we find new proofs of the magnitude of his work. His nearest friends were not prepared for the amount of materials and plans which he left behind. And many are surprised, of those who thought they knew him well, to find in the *Memoir* how much he attempted, and how much accomplished. We have here a list of more than a hundred and fifty publications, separate or in periodicals, in every form of composition, and every department of life. In biography alone, we find sketches of Eminent Philanthropists, notices of Emlyn, Goodier, Abbot, Howe, Priestley, Oberlin, and Howard, with larger *Memoirs* of Parker and Worcester, and the “*Life of the Saviour*.” For the “*Sunday Library*,” and the “*Scenes and Characters illustrating Christian Truth*,” he had extended plans, comprising over twenty

different subjects, or rather classes of subjects, pertaining chiefly to biography and history. Indeed his published writings give no idea of the variety and amount of his productions, planned or partly executed. Nor can we attempt to give an idea. Prose and verse in every form, from the most grave to the most playful, literature, science, religion, narrative, song, child's alphabet, child's prayer, sacred drama, mathematical lecture, besides all the usual forms of professional labor and public service, make an incalculable amount of material, and show at least a wonderful fertility and industry. They show more. They bear almost uniformly the character or the aim of *usefulness*. That word, as has been well said, defines, if one word can, the prevailing feature of his writings and object of all his efforts. But it was a usefulness that had little affinity with common 'utility,' still less with that popular term which to him was offensive — 'expediency.' Seldom has any one labored so much for present want and immediate use, yet with so large and high an aim. Few have done more for the reforms of the day, with such independence of party and faithfulness to principle. No writer has contributed so much, probably, to all the periodicals of the denomination; to no one, certainly, are we more indebted for the origin and success of our religious associations and benevolent efforts. And all this, it will be remembered, with health constantly interrupted, often entirely prostrated, and with scrupulous fidelity to the duties of an arduous profession. He did too much. He attempted enough to task and break the stoutest frame. His own, always frail, bore up with astonishing power for a longer period than any expected, but failed prematurely still. The lesson is to be heeded. In this, if in anything to the eye of man, he erred. Yet who that knew his temperament, the demands made upon him, and all the circumstances of his life, will be the reprover?

We shrink from any attempt at strict analysis or formal description of character. Beside that others did this sufficiently at the time of his death, and the closing chapter of the Memoir embodies much of it, it is less needed than in most prominent cases. No one who knew Henry Ware, will ask to have him described minutely, and we doubt if any who have only read what he has written, require to be informed of his leading traits. The transparent simplicity,

directness, and truthfulness of his character, none mistook in seeing, reading or hearing him. It may be that no one ever thought of his greatness — it must be that no one ever doubted his goodness. Has there been at any time a better instance of the *power* of goodness, not only by itself and upon others directly, but by its influence upon all the faculties, and its agency in producing that harmony of parts, concentration of effort, steadfastness and elevation of purpose, which leave a mark upon the age, such as genius seldom leaves, and common greatness never approaches? With no precocity or early prominence, with no peculiar adaptation or preference for any one branch of study — unless his self-consecration to the ministry be so regarded — with an entire absence of system, and frequent departure from his own rules of mental pursuit, if he formed any, always subject to innumerable and diverse cares, always harassed by infirmity, and fearing utter prostration, — how was it, that he accomplished what he has, that his name stands for so much to so many minds, that his affections, reserved and ever calm, made their way to so many hearts, and that he has left so precious a memory in the community, as teacher, benefactor, and friend? It was by the singleness of his devotion to good ends. It was by the union of qualities, scarcely one of which was distinguished apart, but all of which created a beautiful and powerful whole. It was by an enlarged and enlightened interest in all classes and causes of humanity, with unwavering fidelity to the paramount cause of truth and Christ. It was by firm adherence to his own convictions, with determined justice to others, and the freest charity for all. It was by the forgetfulness of himself alone, in toiling, through life and unto death, for the ignorant, the neglected, the destitute, the intemperate, the hostile, the enslaved, the old in error or sin, the young in innocence and peril. It was, in brief, by the Christian combination of qualities and forces usually separate, and often thought incompatible; gentleness and boldness, freedom and caution, enthusiasm and judgment, active zeal with meek charity, the poet's fire and the preacher's calmness, the reformer's and martyr's spirit with the patience and forbearance of the most practical and humble laborer.

Henry Ware has described "the man of the Beatitudes."

Has he not portrayed himself? He has given us beautiful, and now familiar lines, on "Seasons of Prayer." His life was prayer. Devotion was an element of his soul, and some of his most moving eloquence was in its private and public expression. One of his last employments, after he was stricken, was to compose some prayers for families, in which the "young" might feel that they had a part and an interest. His doctrine of prayer was absolute faith in God, not only as hearing but answering; and in Christ, not as a teacher alone, but as a sympathizer and intercessor. We never talked with him on this subject, we might almost say we never saw him, that we did not find our own faith confirmed. We know not whether his public or private power, his speaking or his silent presence, affected us most. We know only that no speech or silence ever moved us more than has his, and by no life or death have we been more blessed.

With reluctance we leave this pleasant task. It has been to us another interview with one dearly loved. We loved Henry Ware with an affection altogether peculiar; and we speak of it the more freely, because we know it was shared by so many. It is one proof of the singular power of his character, that with so little *expression* he could create such deep and tender love. Is it not felt by multitudes, who have little knowledge of him, except through his life, preaching, and writing? What a place did that life fill in the community, and in the affections of men! What an influence did that preaching and writing exert! And to how many in this country and England will the Memoir go, and find grateful welcome! It carries two portraits of him — imperfect likenesses. It carries his life and letters — and there is the man. Never was a man more visible in his letters. He wrote as he felt; — no effort, and with near friends no restraint. He wrote easily in everything; in letters most rapidly, as without thought yet full of it, now serious and now ludicrous, lavish of sentiment and figure, in English or Latin, prose or poetry. We have letters with not a word of English, and others all in irony — showing the greatest readiness, and amazing versatility. But we speak of his letters here with a single object, to which we have not referred. Many of them show him in the *filial* relation, and bring before us also those inval-

uable letters of his father. Their correspondence gives us a beautiful picture of both. And if no other picture is to be granted us of that venerable man, we do wish that more of his letters to his children could be published. We know their worth, and we know how many they would gratify and bless.

The father has joined his son. They are again together, enjoying an intercourse dependent on no earthly medium. But they are not removed from earthly communion or human affections. Our reverence and love are with them, and their benediction is constantly descending. They both passed away in gradual and unconscious death. They both live in a life that we may share now, and share forever. It was said by one who witnessed the death of the younger — “Tranquilly did that spirit pass, and the peace of heaven settled at once upon that beloved face; such an expression of repose and rest, such a return to youth and its hopeful anticipations, was depicted in it, that it seemed indeed a type of the new birth of the spirit in that new existence which it had just commenced.” With that existence Henry Ware is now familiar. Many has he helped to enter it, and many he is helping still. Long will his words come to us — those words, especially, that conveyed through a brother one of the last messages of his life — and come with a power that goes to fulfil their prayer: —
“Peace and love to the brethren!”

E. B. H.

ART. IX. — RELIGIOUS LIFE OF ENGLAND.*

THE age, it is said, has become “historical.” It is gathering up the fruits of the past history of the race. It is not content with brushing away the dust from old monuments, retracing half effaced inscriptions, gazing at mere facts — the outward, visible life of humanity. It deals with analysis — keen, searching analysis. It has grown philosophical. It is looking at the significance of facts rather than at facts

* *A Retrospect of the Religious Life of England: or the Church, Puritanism, and Free Inquiry.* By JOHN JAMES TAYLER, B. A. London, 1845. 8vo. pp. 563.

themselves,—at their revelations of the interior life of thought and feeling. It collects, arranges, compares, only to get at the hidden meaning or principle. It treats the past as the chemist treats the substances subjected to his examination. It applies tests, it uses the crucible, till it is made to yield up its subtlest spirit or essence. Dr. Dryasdust has his place and office, indispensable ones too, but not the highest in the province of intellect and humanity. Without our Dryasdusts we could not have our Carlyles, who help us to look through the outer garment into the very soul and heart of humanity itself, bring up the "heroes" of the past and cause them to talk to us face to face, write "French Revolutions" and "Cromwelliads." The historian now condenses, generalizes, lays open elementary laws. He may sometimes refine and theorize too much, may occasionally torture the past to make it utter the right word, may by a Procrustes process reduce it to the measure of his system. We think Michelet at times chargeable with this fault, yet what living pictures glow on his pages. History under such a pen becomes instinct with life and soul; it is no longer a mere heap of dry sticks.

The age, we said, is historical, philosophic, analytic. This feature of it appears in Mr. Tayler's book. It is a book for the times, just such a work as the age demanded, and so far as the subject is concerned in some sort new. We know of no one who has treated the subject before him, at least in the same way, for we cannot consider the occasionally subtle analysis, and few glimpses of great principles and of the elementary life of religion, found in Maurice's "Kingdom of Christ" as contributing much to the elucidation of the past "religious life of England."

"Retrospect of the religious life of England,"—to the thoughtful, few themes can be more pregnant and kindling. What images crowd on the mind. What voices come up from the past, in that land where our fathers had their homes,—voices, indeed, not always sweet, nay, sometimes harsh and grating, driving out some of her noblest sons, compelling them to leave the sepulchres of kindred and ancestors, and seek a refuge and "freedom to worship God" on the wild shores of the New World. Yet without a knowledge of the religious history of England we cannot understand our own; and both as descendants of the Pilgrims,

and as Christians, we regard this volume as a most valuable gift sent us by our friends on the other side of the water. The work proves conclusively the rare qualifications of the author for his task; and the manner in which he has executed it places him at once among the acutest and most successful writers of the age. We have not for a long time read a book on which we can bestow heartier commendation. Mr. Tayler possesses, we think, peculiar powers of generalization and nice and profound analysis; and though, in a very modest preface, he speaks of the "inadequacy" of his "materials" for fully developing his "idea" or leading principle, his acquaintance with the facts of the past appears sufficiently intimate and extensive to secure him against any important error in his results; and he is certainly a clear, discriminating, fresh and animated writer, capable, we should say, of rising to strains of no ordinary eloquence. He writes, too, in a delightful spirit. There cannot be one particle of bitterness in his nature; he is no narrow sectarian, no mere partisan, no bigot; and they, who may find it necessary to dissent from some of his opinions, will still give him credit for vigor and acuteness of intellect, while they honor the nobleness of his nature and his evident love of truth.

As the work has not been reprinted among us, we shall be somewhat liberal in our extracts, for which we doubt not we shall receive the thanks of our readers. The design of the work is thus stated in the preface.

"The idea which possessed my mind, when I first sketched out the plan of this volume, was the desirableness of embracing in a common point of view, the phenomena of the different religious parties, whose unintermitted strife and sharp contrast of manners and opinions, have given such a deep and varied interest to the spiritual history of England, especially during the three centuries which have elapsed since the Reformation. In pursuing this idea, I have tried to discover the governing principle and understand the characteristic working of each party — to apprehend their mutual relation — to shew how they have occasionally passed off into each other — and out of their joint operation, to trace the evolution of a more comprehensive principle, which looks above the narrowness of their respective views, and, allying itself with the essential elements of the Christian faith, may in time perhaps devise some method of reconciling an unlimited freedom and variety of the religious

life with the friendliness and mutual recognition of universal brotherhood." — Preface, pp. iv, v.

The author finds, in the history of religious parties in England, three distinctly marked periods: first, "that of Lollardism — the name given in the fifteenth century to the disciples of Wycliffe — extending from the reign of Edward III. to that of Henry VIII.; secondly, that of proper Puritanism, from the Reformation to the extinction of the Commonwealth on the restoration of Charles II.; thirdly, that of Protestant Dissent, from the Restoration to the present day." In these different periods he discovers only "different manifestations of a common principle, tempered by the condition of society and the vigor of opposing tendencies."

"In the ensuing pages," he tells us, "an attempt has been made to discover the distinctive principles, and contrast the effects on our national mind and character, of the English hierarchy and of Puritanism — to exhibit their mutual relation — and to trace out of their joint influence the evolution of a third principle, distinct from each — that of free religious inquiry." — p. 10.

We pass over his section on the "external history of religious parties in England," which of necessity presents only a rapid "sketch" embracing prominent principles and incidents, and come at once to his chapter on the "Church." During the reign of Henry VIII., little change was made in the constitution of the Church, except what necessarily resulted from "dissolving the connexion with Rome, and transferring the ecclesiastical supremacy to the Crown." Articles, however, were framed, explained and illustrated, for fixing the national standard of faith and worship, and a small catechism was issued "by royal authority," called the "King's Primer." An Act was passed for "abolishing diversity of opinions" in religion, called the "Six Articles," which was, "in fact, a re-enactment of the old religion, hailed with joy by all who were averse to the progress of the reformation." The public service of the Church, with some few exceptions, was still conducted in Latin. A Liturgy was set forth, founded chiefly on the "Use of Sarum," but in many churches the Roman breviaries and missals continued to be used as before. The King gave his sanction to an English translation of the Bible, but by an Act of 1542, the reading of it was prohibited to all — "under

the degrees of gentlemen and gentlewomen ;” and the King himself declared that “the reading of the Old and New Testament was not necessary to the laity, but that liberty or restraint in this matter must be referred to the laws and government.” The whole is thus summed up by Mr. Tayler.

“At the close, then, of Henry’s reign — notwithstanding the separation from Rome, and notwithstanding the strong Protestant tendencies of Cranmer — the Mass was still celebrated in Latin; the authorised confession of faith differed in no essential particular from the ancient creed; and the papal canons were still in force: — in other words, the Church, though it had changed its head, was in doctrine, ritual and discipline, as Romanist as ever, and much less free.” — pp. 58, 59.

During the short reign of Edward VI., the Reformation advanced. Homilies were published, the “Six Articles” were repealed, and the injunction to set up the Bible in the churches, “accompanied now by a translation of Erasmus’s paraphrase of the New Testament,” was renewed.

“Their next object was to draw up a Book of Common Prayer and other devotional offices. That the establishment of a form of public Service should have preceded the publication of articles of faith — so contrary to the practice of the continental Reformers — is a significant fact in the history of the English Church, and was owing to the caution of Cranmer and the judgment of Ridley, who thought it desirable to reconcile the bulk of the nation to the changes that were proceeding in religion, by the use of a liturgy not too widely divergent from the forms they were accustomed to, before they set forth a public declaration of belief. It is said, that Cranmer had prepared a Service of a more decidedly Protestant tone, but that the Romanist influence was too powerful in the committee charged with the business, to admit of his procuring its adoption. Many of the more zealous Protestants and the Calvinistic Reformers generally (though there were exceptions) disliked a liturgy; and the course taken by the divines of Edward’s time, while it conciliated numbers who were attached to the old religion, distinguished the Church of England by a broad external sign from the Reformed Churches of the Continent, and has had a lasting influence on its constitution and character. In the composition of the Prayer Book, a respect for antiquity and established usage — characteristic from the first, of the measures of the Anglican Reformation — largely predominated. A great part of it was translated from the Latin of the previous Catholic Service, enriched by selections from the ancient lit-

urgies of the Gallican, Spanish, Alexandrine and Oriental Churches." — pp. 62, 63.

Edward's first Service Book was issued in 1549: some revisions afterwards took place, chiefly at the instigation of foreign Protestants, by which it parted with something of its Popish character, but in its essential features it remained unchanged. After some account of the origin of the Thirty-nine Articles, which, as well as the Homilies, Mr. Tayler pronounces Calvinistic, though the Church itself has been often, we believe we may say for the most part, Arminian, he thus states the "general characteristics of the Anglican Church."

"Such, then, are the elements which enter into the composition of the Church of England, as exhibited separately in its Prayer Book, its Discipline, and its Articles. It remains to inquire, what has been their operation, combined as an organic whole, and viewed in the course of their historical development. — How shall we express the individuality which has marked the Anglican hierarchy, since it acquired a fixed character and subsistence, and which still distinguishes it from other religious societies? — If I mistake not, we find its distinctive attributes in a certain assumption of national independence and ascendancy, kept in check by the power of the State, and often greatly neutralized by the influence of enlightened and moderate men within its pale — but still manifesting itself, when circumstances have thrown it forcibly back on its inherent tendencies, and allowed it free scope for action, — in a spirit of domination and exclusiveness — in a haughty and aristocratical bearing, fitly represented by its episcopal constitution — which betrays equal impatience of the foreign jurisdiction of the Pope, and of democratic pretensions at home. Herein we discover the reason of its reluctance to acknowledge the Protestant Churches of the Continent, and of its instinctive aversion from the popular elements entering so largely into the movements of the Reformation, to which those Churches owed their origin. Such tendencies may no doubt be ascribed in part to the circumstances of a wealthy and powerful establishment, but partly also they have their source in the spirit of the Prayer-book itself, and in the very nature of episcopal government, for they do not entirely cease, where, as among the Episcopalians of Scotland and the United States, the peculiar influences of an establishment are wanting. The Church of England displays the kind of pride which belongs to an ancient lineage, and has many sympathies with the recollections of feudalism. She claims a high descent and the prescription of a long-established title; and, while

exulting, in the very spirit of the old baronial independence, at the thought of having cast off a foreign yoke, and purged herself free from the grosser corruptions of Popery, she holds herself aloof with an air of conscious superiority, from the sects of more recent origin that have rapidly shot up into consequence at her side. She takes her stand on the principle of authority; for, although in the fundamental charter of her reformed constitution, she appeals to Scripture for her right, she nevertheless authoritatively defines the sense of Scripture, and in her practice forbids any one to dispute it." — pp. 84–86.

The sections which treat of the "High Sacerdotal and Regal Doctrines and Prevalence of Arminianism under the Stuarts," of the "Influence of Low Church Principles after the Revolution," and of what the author calls the "Modern Period," embracing the eighteenth century, Methodism, and the Puseyite movement which has its root in the past, deserve an attentive perusal, and had we room would furnish some good extracts. In the retrospect of the history of the Anglican Church, the author finds demonstration of the "utter inutility of Creeds, Articles, and a settled form of Prayer, to preserve agreement in belief, or even harmony of feeling, among its members."

We proceed now to Puritanism. "Absolute freedom of inquiry," Mr. Tayler considers as "one of the latest results of advanced intellectual culture." It is rather the consequence of Puritanism than one of its essential and characteristic features.

"The fundamental idea of Puritanism," says he, "in all its forms and ramifications, is the supreme authority of Scripture, acting directly on the individual conscience — as opposed to a reliance on the priesthood and the outward ordinances of the Church. To realise the standard of faith, worship and conduct, recorded in Scripture, has ever been the object of Puritanism; and to attain that object, in defiance of a hierarchy, requires no small degree of self-reliance and decision of purpose. But with Puritanism the range of inquiry is shut up within the limits of the written Word; it does not venture to sally forth beyond them, and survey the Scripture under a broader aspect, from some point of view external to it. Where, as in the case of Baxter and some others of a later period, the principle of rigid Scripturalism was less firmly grasped, they approached the confines of the Latitudinarian system, and ceased, to that extent, to be proper Puritans." — pp. 131, 132.

Again,

"The sufficiency of Scripture is the fundamental postulate of Puritanism; the authority of the Church, the ground practically taken by the Anglican hierarchy: and these incompatible assumptions have been the cause of the unintermitted strife between them, through the last four or five centuries of our history. Scripture — the record and depository of the free and popular spirit of the primitive Gospel — the Magna Charta of religious liberty — is a standing witness and protest against the pretensions of spiritual despotism. In the spirit which it breathes, we find a reason of the ardent attachment to it ever manifested by those, who at different periods have struggled against episcopal tyranny and called aloud for ecclesiastical reform — from the African sectaries who resisted Cyprian and were persecuted by Augustine, down to the Waldenses, the Hussites and the Lollards of the Middle Ages; and in the same spirit we detect a motive for the efforts of the priesthood to keep the dispensation of the Word of life in their own hands, and prevent its free circulation among the laity. The conflict pervades the whole of Christian history, and goes back to the first ages of the Church. If mere antiquity could decide the question at issue, Puritanism, through its authentic representatives from the earliest times, might at least make out as venerable a pedigree, and establish as clear a line of apostolical descent, as Episcopacy. Taking the word Puritanism in the large sense which has been explained, we may trace the identity of the principle, in all its most striking manifestations, through every period of its history, whether oppressed by a Catholic, or in collision with a Protestant, hierarchy. Under all outward changes, we shall find, that Scripturalism, a severe morality, popular sympathies and warm attachment to civil freedom, have constituted the sign and peculiar distinction of Puritanism." — pp. 133, 134.

The writer passes in rapid review "Lollardism" and Wycliffe, the "Incipient Puritanic Movements" under Henry VIII., "High Presbyterianism under Elizabeth," the "Qualified Presbyterianism at the close of the sixteenth, and in the first half of the seventeenth, century," and comes to "Independency, and the more Extreme Forms of Puritanism."

The origin and progress of these are exhibited in a lucid style, with a happy selection of incidents and illustrations, so far as the object of the work requires or admits. In the interval between the Restoration and the Revolution, the "character of the Puritanic movement underwent a change." The "influence of distinguished teachers on the historical

development of Puritanism" during this period is illustrated by some very well drawn sketches and portraits.

"The men of this period form the transition-class between the old Puritan of the time of the wars, and the Protestant Dissenter recognised by the Toleration Act of the Revolution. With them we are immediately connected, through the foundation of our religious societies, and the possession at this day of many principles and tendencies which they have transmitted to us. The memory of our great-grandfathers reaches back to the time when their personal influence was strong and active in the world. They are our spiritual ancestors — the fathers of English Protestant Dissent. This was the period that witnessed the painful ministry, the prolific tongue and pen, the severe and saintlike virtue, sweetened with a holy meekness — of Baxter, Owen, Bates, and Howe in the metropolis — of Heywood, Fairfax, Newcome, Henry, and Flavel in the provinces — men, who lived on their convictions, and giving themselves up, like true prophets of God, to the inspirations of faith and duty, fulfilled amidst all the disquietudes of a troubled and persecuted life, with court and priests and magistrates against them, — the solemn vow they had laid on their souls, to preach, at whatever cost, the truths of eternal life to sinful and dying men." — pp. 222, 223.

Of Baxter, Mr. Tayler thus speaks: —

"Of the great Presbyterian party, Baxter stands forth as the most conspicuous representative. I have already explained, that the term Presbyterian — as the name of a party — had ceased to denote exclusive attachment to that form of Church government, but embraced all who were not from principle Separatists, and who desired a national settlement of religion, on the broad basis of purification and reform. In this aim, Baxter heartily concurred; to promote it was the governing principle of his ecclesiastical and doctrinal system. He shunned extremes, and sought a common centre; and, in this respect, his mind was essentially eclectic. His chief ground of difference with the Independents was, in his own phrase, 'their separating strictness.' Under the guidance of this principle, Baxter's mind became more tolerant, enlarged, and catholic, the longer he lived. Its distinguishing attributes were uncommon vigor and acuteness, delighting almost to excess in the exercise of dialectic subtlety, great fervor of spirit, simplicity of purpose, and inflexible honesty. Though he had not the advantage of an University education, he was deeply read on the subjects that were then conceived to belong to divinity, and would have had a higher reputation for learning, had he written less. But the pen was scarcely ever out of his hand, and of his voluminous productions,

the far greater part were occasional, and thrown off at a heat for some immediate practical object. In the noble earnestness of his character, he thought less of literary fame, than the interests of the human soul." — pp. 223, 224.

Baxter began as a strong Calvinist, but his opinions afterwards became much softened, and he "fixed his attention chiefly, the older he grew, on rectitude of heart and practical goodness;" he believed that "the points at issue between Calvinists and Arminians did not so involve fundamental truths, as to be necessary grounds of separation;" his views of the Trinity were charged with "deficiency in clearness and precision," and his "own later exposition of them took the form of Sabellianism." "Sometimes in the silence of his study, yearning after reality and usefulness, he longed for the adventurous life of a missionary, that he might be no more wearied with words, but grappling with facts, go forth and preach the Gospel to the savage and the heathen." His spirit and example exerted a deep influence on the next generation of Nonconformists.

"Belonging to the same party, but with a character less ardent and earnest, and of manners more gentle, complying and polished — were Bates and Howe."

"A man of a different stamp, — more profoundly learned in theology, of an intellect more severely consequential and rigidly dogmatic, but less open, genial, and comprehensive, — was Dr. Owen, the celebrated leader of the Independents. The Congregational system had been supported by some great names before his time, but his numerous writings, high reputation, and great personal influence, gave it form and character, and impressed upon it the peculiar features of his mind, as Baxter left his on Presbyterianism." — p. 232.

Owen received repeated marks of favor and confidence from Cromwell, whom he accompanied into Ireland and Scotland, and in 1651 was appointed "Dean of Christ Church and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford." He was once a member of Parliament, was zealous in defence of the Commonwealth, and "himself raised a troop of horse at Oxford." He declared against Cromwell's assumption of the title of King, after which a "coolness grew up between them."

"After the Restoration, Owen, of course, shared in the general disgrace and discouragement of the Puritan party; but having a considerable private estate, he lived in comparative ease

and comfort, exposed only to occasional annoyances, and enjoyed the protection and countenance of many persons of rank and influence. Clarendon himself was in the number of his friends. His church in Berry Street was attended by some of the old Commonwealth officers, Fleetwood and Colonel Desborough. Dissatisfied with the state of things in the old country, he was at one time preparing to emigrate to New England, where he had been invited to undertake the presidency of Harvard College; but he was prevented by an order from the Council. A similar invitation he had received from Academic bodies in Holland. He died in 1683, on the anniversary of the ejection under the Act of Uniformity." — p. 234.

"The character and principles of Owen present in several respects a marked contrast to those of Baxter. Each had his own decided view of the great questions of religious truth and liberty in which they were both, with equal piety and earnestness, engaged; and when the grave had closed over Owen's remains, Baxter paid a hearty and generous tribute to the distinguished worth and endowments of one who had been his frequent opponent in life. Owen's Congregational principles, though involving by necessary consequence a toleration of different forms of worship and Church government — at least among Christians — rather tended to encourage narrow and rigid terms of communion within the limits of each particular Church. 'None,' says he, 'but those who give evidence of being regenerated, or holy persons, ought to be received or counted fit members of visible Churches; where this is wanting, the very essence of a Church is lost.' Baxter, on the other hand, abhorring separation, and aiming at nationality, would have taken in all quiet and visible Christians, that did not break in on the established Church order, from the Papist on one side, to the Socinian on the other. Spiritual purity — freedom from all heretical mixtures — was the essence of a true Church in the view of Owen; comprehensiveness was its outward sign and recommendation, in that of Baxter. Owen disapproved of worshipping in the national churches; Baxter never withdrew from their communion, and only recurred occasionally to the use of separate assemblies, as a necessity that was forced upon him against his will. Baxter, as he advanced in life, approached nearer in his views to Arminianism; Owen retained his Calvinism to the last. Baxter shrank from a very decided assertion of the Trinity; Owen stood forth in his '*Vindiciæ Evangelicæ*' to confute the Unitarianism of Biddle. Baxter was for amalgamating all parties; Owen, on the contrary, was a great promoter of the Savoy Confession, which coming after the labors of the Westminster divines, could only have the effect of marking off the Independents as a distinct body from the Presbyterians. Baxter

interpreted the Bible with a breadth and freedom of view, and a continued reference to the priority and supremacy of the Spirit, which bordered on the theology of Fox and Barclay. Owen was rigidly Scriptural; so that, when Brian Walton published his *Polyglott*, he was alarmed at the bold views put forth in the prolegomena and appendix, respecting the original text, and vindicated its purity and integrity in a treatise, 'Of the divine original and authority of the Scriptures.' Owen was profoundly skilled in the theology of his age and school, and had communed much with his own heart, and narrowly watched the manifestations of the religious life in close spiritual intercourse with various members of his own Church; Baxter had warmer sympathies with general humanity, and read its indications with a more open and excursive eye. Baxter had great simplicity of character and directness of purpose; while Owen combined with remarkable spirituality of mind, a larger share of shrewd caution, knowledge of affairs, and worldly depth and penetration, than usually falls to the lot of a student and divine." — pp. 235–237.

"We trace the different principles of the two men, in the divergent tendencies of the Presbyterian and Independent sections of the old Puritan body, of which they were respectively the heads. The Presbyterians were always hoping for comprehension; the Independents were satisfied with a tolerated separation. The former always associated the cause of civil, with that of religious, liberty; the latter were led by their principles to keep the ideas of Church and State more distinct, and to overlook sometimes, in a tendency towards extreme spirituality, their reciprocal action and dependence. Among the Presbyterians, the constant movement of opinion was towards Arminianism and its related doctrines; among the Independents, we witness an effort in the contrary direction, to uphold the primitive Calvinism. We may look on Owen as the founder of rigid, and Baxter of moderate, Dissent." — p. 238.

Turning over some pages relating to the Anabaptists and Quakers, and the "Rise of permanent Nonconformist Societies," we come to the chapter on the "Church and Puritanism contrasted." We wish we could afford some extracts on this subject, which is treated with discrimination and thoroughness. We offer no apology for the length of the following passage on the influence of Puritanism on literature.

"The influence of Puritanism is often represented as hostile to elegant literature. Its short-lived ascendancy, beset with danger and consumed in strife, had indeed little leisure for the soft dalliance of the Muses. But the sublime incarnation of its

spirit in the poetry of Milton, must forever repel the imputation of incompatibility with the very highest form of literary excellence; and even its homely, popular, expression in the pregnant allegory of Bunyan, yielded nutriment to the national heart, at least as wholesome and generous as the banter of *Hudibras*, which was the delight of the reinstated Royalists.

It is a curious speculation — not so remote from the present subject as to forbid a moment's entertainment — what might have been the effect on the subsequent development of our literature if the triumph of Puritanical principles under Cromwell had been lasting, and prevented the Restoration. Twice in the course of our history has our native literature — the spontaneous growth of the Saxon element which is so widely diffused through our population, and forms the very heart of our national character — been submerged beneath a foreign influence breaking in upon it from France. The earliest poetry of our nascent English — if we except a few songs and ballads circulated among the lowest classes — was in its form, its spirit, and for the most part even in its materials — essentially Norman. Chaucer and Gower wrote for the court and the nobles — not for the people. Towards the close of the fifteenth century, the genuine English spirit rose into influence, and strengthened by a continual accession of popular elements, in which religion had perhaps the largest share, brought forth in little more than a century and a half an exuberance of literary fruit, whose rich juice and racy flavor proclaim it the unforced produce of our native soil. Within this period sprang up our national drama — that breathing expression of English life. To it belong the greatest and most original of our authors, uniting a wild fertility of imagination, as yet unbroken by criticism, with a masculine strength of thought — the fathers of our eloquence and poetry — Spenser, Shakspeare, Milton, Hooker, Raleigh, and Bacon. With whatever party in Church and State they may outwardly be classed, these noble minds are thoroughly English in feeling, and instinct with the spirit of progress and mental independence. Their works announce that redundancy of moral and intellectual energy, which, craving after some higher good, but not at one with itself as to the form and measure of it, at length broke out into action and spent itself on civil discord. The movement in this direction ceased with the expiration of the Commonwealth. On the return of Charles, a second inundation of French influence overwhelmed our manners and our literature. The poetry of 'the blind old schoolmaster,' John Milton, was forgotten; the drama of Shakspeare, Massinger, and Fletcher, true to nature and humanity, whose last echoes died away in the feebler genius of Otway — was replaced by the rhyming tragedies of Dryden; and the soul of native inspiration which breathed in

our ancient song, expired under the fetters of art imposed on it by a Parisian criticism.

This change could not have occurred had Puritanism maintained its ascendancy. Milton would have become the immediate model of imitation, and his influence must have introduced a severer taste and a purer tone of sentiment. At the same time, his scholarlike feelings and healthful mind would have preserved from the ignorant contempt and destruction of fanatical zeal, the precious remains of our older literature. Even under Puritanical rule, the mind of England would doubtless have been gradually affected by the progress of European ideas: — but the very different relation in which we should then have stood towards France, must have prevented our writers from taking her classical productions as a standard of excellence; and Dryden and Pope — in the form at least which their genius actually assumed, and with the influence which they exerted on the literature of the Revolution — could not have existed. Their vigorous and polished couplet, embodying sharp epigrammatic contrasts of thought, and their inimitable art of reasoning in verse — so well adapted to a cold and satirical cast of mind, and the effect of reaction against an over-strained enthusiasm — were never, however, in perfect harmony with the latent sympathies of the people; they floated over the surface of society, but did not penetrate to its living depths.” — pp. 284–287.

We must here somewhat abruptly, from want of space, terminate our notice of this interesting volume, which we regret the more, as the remaining chapter relating to “Free Inquiry” leads us over a rich and varied field. We can only indicate some of the topics which are, with greater or less brevity, treated in it. They are — the distinction between the independence of religious societies and the freedom of the individual mind; different elements of religious freedom evolved during the seventeenth century; re-action against the doctrines of the first Reformers; rise of latitudinarian principles; effect of philosophical theories and scientific discoveries; first school of English Unitarianism; influence of the writings of Locke; Dissenting academies; character and position of Doddridge; English deism; influence of Hartley’s philosophy; revival of Unitarianism by Priestley; Orthodox dissent; Channing; influence of Germany; powerful organization of Independency. We part with Mr. Tayler with many thanks for a volume from which the public will derive both pleasure and profit, and in the hope of being soon permitted to renew our intercourse with him through some other work from his pen.

A. L.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

The Extent of the Atonement, in its Relation to God and the Universe. By THOMAS W. JENKYN, D. D., President of Coward College, London. Second American, from the third revised London edition. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1846. 12mo. pp. 266.

The Union of the Holy Spirit and the Church in the Conversion of the World. By THOMAS W. JENKYN, D. D., Author of "The Extent of the Atonement," etc. First American from the second revised London edition. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1846. 12mo. pp. 304.

THE first of these volumes would amuse us as a curiosity, were it not matter of sorrow rather, to witness so signal an illustration of the power of theological system or prejudice in warping the intellect, and perverting or confounding all its conceptions of right and wrong. "Atonement," whether we regard etymology or Scriptural use, means, as every tyro in theology knows, reconciliation. Not so, however, does Dr. Jenkyn define the term, but thus: "Atonement," says he, "is an expedient substituted in the place of the literal infliction of the threatened penalty, so as to supply to the government just and good grounds for offering and dispensing pardon to the offender;" that is, is "substitution," — as the author applies it in the case of Christ, "a substitution of his person instead of the offenders; and a substitution of his sufferings instead of their punishment." All this as an "expedient" to satisfy the claims of "justice" and "sustain the interests of moral government!" This is the old "Governmental theory" as it has been called, but which will not do for this nineteenth century. How long, we may ask, could human governments stand, if administered on such a principle? And how long will theologians continue to abuse the patience of the public, and set at defiance all the laws of common sense and sound biblical criticism, and shock our moral perceptions and our reverence, by the utterance of such absurdities? Truly may the author say that the "sufferings of Christ," thus viewed, "were perfectly novel in the universe," and that they "posed and amazed all angelic intelligences." Well they might.

The *influence* of the "atonement" the author does not regard as confined to man, but as extending through the universe, natural, it would seem, as well as moral. Thus the title of one of his chapters is, "On the atonement in its relation to all the works of God," that is, as he explains it, the "whole universe."

He says, "Nature, providence, and grace, then, are three immense wheels in one machinery, — the cogs, and revolutions of each, catching and influencing those of the others, and all put in motion by the great atonement." All true science, then, for ought we see, must be regarded as founded on the "atonement." "There is no class of truths," he affirms, "which may not be either proved or explained by the principles of the atonement." "There is not a truth pertaining to God and man, to eternity and time, but is connected with him," that is, Christ. "In him all truths live, move and have their being." Further, in reference to the extent of the atonement he says, "the intelligences of other worlds are positively benefitted by sharing in the blessings" of it. "God has no medium, no way of blessing any being, in any world, but the mediation of Christ!" As if Dr. Jenkyn knew anything of God's government of other worlds. What miserable presumption! In conformity with this view he calls Christ, with sufficiently questionable taste, "the President of the universe," — the "great President," — and speaks of what the "illustrious President of the universe himself has said." Still worse, in point of taste at least, he tells us that "in his official character, Christ is the Receiver General of all the revenues of God's immense empire." Again, "it is his work, as the public officer of the moral commonwealth, to present to God all the reverence," etc. We want words to express the disgust with which such language fills us. It shocks every sentiment of reverence for the Saviour. It pains us to observe that a book of this character, after having gone through three London editions, should have arrived at a second edition in this country. Alas for the popular theology when it is fed from such channels.

The volume on the "Union of the Holy Spirit and the Church," is in our view far less exceptionable, and though tainted with a remnant of the old scholastic theology, portions of it contain sound views, which we recommend to the special attention of those who are accustomed to regard the Divine spirit as working by "fits" and "impulses," or in any way "arbitrarily," or "irrespectively of means."

L.

Walt and Vult, or The Twins. Translated from the Flegeljahre of Jean Paul. By the AUTHOR of the "Life of Jean Paul." Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1845. 2 vols. 16mo. pp. 320, 311.

It is with much diffidence that we express our regret, that the graceful and efficient powers of the translator of these volumes had not been applied to some other work. Not that we think the "Flegeljahre" unworthy of being translated. That would

express more than our meaning. We doubt not that Jean Paul knew his public very well; that he wrote for their entertainment and instruction; and we know that there was very small chance of his writing for those objects otherwise than successfully. He was not likely to fail in any literary enterprise which he undertook in earnest. But as he sat quietly composing this work in Coburg, he had before his eye, not the literary circles of Boston, Philadelphia, or London, but of Leipsic, Weimar and Göttingen. It is impossible that a book of this character, so dependent for its interest on a knowledge, on the part of the reader, of events and characters local and transient, of minor habits of thought and expression, of national peculiarities and current by-words, that such a book should not suffer prodigiously, by being transferred to another intellectual climate and to a foreign soil. Add to this the loss that works of humor and satire always must sustain by any, even the best translation, — such as this is, — and it will not appear strange that “Walt and Vult” should be laid down by many persons with a feeling of disappointment.

The work itself, in its design, is an ample illustration of Richter's pet idea, — the painful disparity between the loftiness of man's, especially a poet's ideal, and the meagreness of his attainments; between the boundless aspiration of his faculties, and the wretched poverty of his acquisitions; between the breadth and magnitude of his purposes, and his miserable failures in fulfilling them. It is indeed a noble and a solemn theme. It is worthy the power and pathos of the most inspired genius. In this particular instance, however, we cannot possibly see why a true poet might not combine something of the intellectual elevation, pure fervor, and meditative wisdom of “Walt,” with a respectable share of that knowledge of the world and address in society, which appears in “Vult.” Both belong to humanity, and we do not believe they are necessarily disjoined. Literary history affords distinguished examples of their harmonious union. Need poets and prophets be simpletons, or simply ridiculous? — This work is marked by Jean Paul's characteristics, — a vivid perception, a broad reach of vision, a various culture, an affluence of imagery, sometimes fanciful, a genial sympathy with all forms and departments of life, and the capability to make them serve his artistic ends. He enters so heartily into his subject, and writes so eminently from a love of writing, that it is difficult to conceive that he could ever have been under the necessity to make books for bread. Notwithstanding what we have said here, we believe, and are happy to believe, that these volumes are welcomed and read by a large class of persons with unqualified interest.

H.

- A History of Music in New England. With Biographical Sketches of Reformers and Psalmists.* By GEORGE HOOD. Boston: Wilkins, Carter & Co. 1846. 16mo. pp. 250.
- Memoirs of a New England Village Choir. With Occasional Reflections.* By a MEMBER. Third edition. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 18mo. pp. 152.
- The Messiah; an Oratorio, composed in the year 1741.* By GEORGE FREDERICK HANDEL. Boston: Wilkins, Carter & Co. 1846. Fol. pp. 188.

THE first of these volumes contains a history of old psalmody in New England, rather than of music. Indeed the author says, the "history of music in New England, for the first two centuries, is the history of psalmody alone." The title of the work leads the reader to expect too much, and most persons probably will lay down the book with a feeling of disappointment. It can make no claim to artistic excellence; it contains, nevertheless, much curious matter — many choice gleanings from dusty records, for which the author will receive the thanks of those who take an interest in the religious history of New England. Rude indeed was the old singing from Ainsworth's Version and the Bay Psalm Book, which were used through the greater part of the first century, and in many churches to a later period. What would our modern congregations say to singing "at one standing" a Psalm of 130 lines, occupying sometimes half an hour? Some scrupled to sing anything but David's Psalms, while some objected to singing them at all in "these days of the New Testament," thinking it ought to be left to the members, who had "received a Psalm from the enditement of the Spirit," to sing, the others saying Amen at the close. Another question was, whether women, as well as men, might be allowed to sing; another, whether it should be permitted to any but "Church members;" and another still, "whether it be lawfull to sing Psalms in meeter devised by men," or "uninspired tunes." These and similar questions were discussed with no little warmth in the early days of the Colonies. Very uncouth was the Church music of those days, if music it could be called: and it went on declining till about the year 1720, when a strenuous effort was made to reform it. This was difficult, for many contended for the prevailing custom of "lining out" the Psalm, as it was called, by the deacon, and also for singing "by rote," which for many years had been the only mode. Some of the objections made to "singing by rote" are amusing enough: — it was "a new way, an unknown tongue" — it was "not so melodious as the old way" — "it was Popish" — it "would introduce instruments" — the "names of the notes were blasphemous" — and finally, "it was needless, the old way being good enough."

Many cases of conscience came up; pamphlets were written, and sermons preached and published, and the whole community was, for the space of ten years or more, thrown into a state of the greatest ferment. Rev. Mr. Walter says of the singing of the day, it sounded "like five hundred tunes roared out at the same time." — But we are exceeding our limits, and must conclude with observing, that unskilfully as the volume is put together, and defective as it is in many respects, it yet does something to fill a void in our ecclesiastical history, and we should rather thank the author for what he has done, than complain that he has not done more or better. The work must have cost him much labor.

The *Memoirs of a New England Village Choir*, the first edition of which appeared several years ago, may not be known to all our readers as the production of one whose ministry has long kept him at a distance from New England, but whose graceful pen records the impressions of early life with equal sprightliness and fidelity. The charms of this pleasant piece of fiction — if such it must be called — need no commendation of ours. It is enough to announce a new edition.

The *Oratorio of Handel* is a reprint from the latest London edition, by Bishop, in which the "vocal parts are given complete, and the most important of the instrumental parts (including those added by Mozart)." Of the merits of the "*Messiah*" it might be presumptuous, and it would certainly be superfluous, for us to speak. We only wish to draw attention to this (second) American edition, which does credit to the typographical art among us. L.

Martyria: A Legend, wherein are contained Homilies, Conversations, and Incidents of the Reign of Edward the Sixth. Written by WILLIAM MOUNTFORD, Clerk. London: J. Chapman. 1845. 16mo. pp. 368.

WE had, some months ago, prepared a short article on this volume, the contents of which first appeared in the "*Christian Pioneer*," published at Glasgow, and had marked some pages for extract; but other matter, which pressed for insertion, has necessarily excluded it, and we must now content ourselves with a brief notice. The "*Legend*" has little regularity of plan, the narrative being in a great measure subordinate to the sentiment. It purports to refer to "*early Unitarian Times*;" and looking at modern Unitarianism simply, one can hardly deny the claim of the reign of Edward VI., between the years 1547 and 1553, to be so called. There was then, in truth, a great deal of Unitarianism. Thought was more free than afterwards, when the doc-

trines and discipline of the Church had been settled by authority. Orthodox writers take notice of the spread of Unitarianism and of the alarm it occasioned, and violent methods were adopted to suppress it. The honest Strype speaks of these methods as "more rugged than seemed agreeable to the principles of the Gospel;" but, he says, they were "thought necessary," Arianism "showed itself so openly and was in such danger of spreading farther." "Rugged methods," indeed, they were, and Joan Bocher, called also Joan of Kent, and in the "Legend," Jane Bouchier, was one of the victims. She, says Fuller, in a passage, which a spirit so humane never should have penned, "with one or two Arians were all who, and *that justly*, died in this king's reign for their opinions." Enough surely in a short reign of six years.

Such were the "early times" of English Unitarianism referred to in the "Martyria," and undoubtedly in the main features truly represented. Fiction, indeed, is often truer than history, as it more vividly pictures out the times to our imagination. But this is far from being the sole, or chief merit of the work. It contains many passages of a calm, meditative beauty and kindling devotion, which can hardly fail of calling forth an answering note in the soul of the reader, — many passages marked by no ordinary purity both of thought and expression. The interest is not equally sustained in all parts of the volume, yet there is little of it we should be willing to spare. Its tone is throughout cheerful and healthy, and few, we think, who read to be made better, or who delight in devout sentiment without cant, will begin the book without a desire to finish it.

Since the above notice was in type we have learned with pleasure, that an American edition of the "Martyria" is about to be issued by Messrs. Crosby & Nichols. We doubt not that the volume will meet with a ready and extensive sale. L.

Confessions of an Early Martyr. By Mrs. H. V. CHENEY, Author of "Sketches from the Life of Christ," etc. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 18mo. pp. 141.

THIS little volume, though juvenile in its aspect, and not unsuited to the capacities of the young, may be read by persons of mature age with interest and profit. Even those most intimately acquainted with ecclesiastical history will find it, not only deeply impressive, but useful in reviving their recollection of important facts. Fictitious in form, it is true to history in substance, and presents a picture, at once vivid and accurate, of the perils and sufferings to which converts to Christianity were exposed, among the Romans, in the latter half of the first century. We know

of no other book, of so small a size, to be compared with this, as to its fitness to convey forcibly to the mind an adequate idea of the almost incredible hazard and cost, at which men and women, belonging especially to the higher ranks of life, exchanged the Pagan for the Christian religion, in the earliest age of the Church. Are there any in our day who fancy their sufferings from persecution extreme? They may learn, perhaps to their advantage, from the few pages of this work, that martyrdom now is not precisely what it was in the reign of Nero. B.

Studies in Religion. By the AUTHOR of "Words in a Sunday School." New York. 1845. 18mo. pp. 230.

Questions adapted to the Text of the New Testament. Designed for Children in Sunday Schools. With Hints for explanation and remark by the Teachers. Number One — Matthew. By C. SOULE CARTEE, one of the Superintendents of Harvard Church Sunday School, Charlestown, Mass. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1846. 18mo. pp. 99.

The Teacher's New Year's Present. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 24mo. pp. 48.

THE first of these books contains twenty-four "Studies," or essays, six of which are in verse. The prose is better than the poetry, and the sentiment and thought of both are better than the style. The "Studies" seem to have been designed to be read to an advanced class in a Sunday school; though we cannot think that many young persons would be found capable of understanding them well enough to enjoy or to be greatly benefitted by them. What, for example, could a young reader make of such a sentence as the following? "Conviction, that thought, sentiment, principle, is supreme, is the sent of God, always leads to the *lying down* for their sakes, of passion and interest and ease,—but such sacrifice alone gives divineness to life, and when the outward is vanquished, that which survives is seen to be the son of God." Still, the author has evidently, besides a lively imagination, a thoughtful and speculative mind; and displays considerable originality. The book is suggestive, and embodies many fine thoughts.

The object and plan of Mr. Cartee's "Questions" strike us very favorably. The Introduction contains valuable suggestions to Sunday school teachers, particularly with respect to the use of the New Testament. The author declares it to be the design of his book, "to make the young better acquainted with the sacred text itself." Clear and judiciously selected questions are proposed, for the children to answer in the words of the Evangelists. Prefixed to each question is the number of the verse in which

the answer is to be found, and appended to the series of questions upon each chapter is "a section for the teacher, pointing out some of the most prominent words and phrases requiring explanation, and suggesting topics for reflection and application." The Sunday school teacher will find this, we believe, a useful book.

The "Teacher's Present" is a compilation of poetical pieces, with an original introductory letter to the children of the Sunday school connected with the Bulfinch Street church. Attractive to those for whom it was prepared as a token of their pastor's kindness, it may also be interesting to others. The selections are, generally, well adapted to please and improve the youthful reader. It strikes us that there may be one objection to the book, we mean a too frequent use of the subject of *death*. In our opinion it is neither wise, nor right, to give so much prominence as is often done in children's books to this theme, or to use it so freely for the purpose of making serious impressions upon the young mind, and calling forth the sympathies of the tender heart. Harm may, insensibly, be done in this way to children, and wrong to Christianity.

R.

Onward! Right Onward! By MRS. L. C. TUTHILL, Author of "I will be a Gentleman," etc. Second Edition. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 18mo. pp. 169.

The Boy of Spirit. A Story for the Young. Second Edition. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 18mo. pp. 117.

The Lost Wheelbarrow and other Stories. By ANNE W. ABBOT, Author of Willie Rogers, Kate & Lizzie, etc. Boston: S. G. Simpkins. 1846. pp. 172.

WE have an opinion of our own, as to the kind of books it is most desirable that children should read, which forbids our believing that the highest standard of excellence is so often reached in this department of literature, as many seem to suppose. It affords us pleasure, nevertheless, to commend every attempt, that is in a good measure successful, to furnish the young with works which are at once interesting and instructive. Among the volumes which, in our view, possess more than ordinary merit, we class the three, whose titles are given above.—"Onward! Right Onward!" by Mrs. Tuthill, is a tale, which few persons, whether old or young, will begin without reading through. It abounds in forcible and pathetic sketches of the evils resulting from pride of genius joined to instability of purpose and strong feelings, together with delightful illustrations of a wise and affectionate sister's power to reclaim a wayward brother from wrong courses. Perhaps the book would have been more useful to common

readers, had "Fairy Feza" not been quite so faultless, and if her brother "Herbert" had been less frequently hurried, by his ruling passion, to the extreme of offensive behavior.—"The Boy of Spirit" appears to have been written with the best intentions; and we are pleased, in general, with its style. Its object is to discourage that impatient, rash, and quarrelsome disposition, which so many regard as indicative of a noble nature, and to win love and respect for the opposite qualities of character. The story, we think, is well suited to accomplish the end which the author had in view. It contains two suggestions, however, that seem to us of at least doubtful tendency; one, in the first chapter, apparently commendatory of "James Adair" for saying to his master, "I cannot tell," when requested to give the name of a vicious boy who had perpetrated a crime in school; the other, near the close of the book, where, in the account of "Frank Pierson's" sudden death-bed repentance, reference is had to "that stream which could make his sins, though scarlet, white as snow."—The volume by Miss Abbot contains four stories, "The Lost Wheelbarrow," "The Dance of the Mice," "Little Horace," and "Honest Cuff," which, though not of equal merit, are all told in an easy and natural manner; and the moral impressions they produce are of the best kind. We would suggest to this lady, who, by her manifest love for children and intimate acquaintance with their habits of thought and feeling, as well as by her general intelligence and sound judgment, seems better qualified than most writers to supply the wants of juvenile readers, whether her tales would not be more effective for good, if they were so composed as that each, instead of being very miscellaneous in character, should have for its chief end the enforcing of one great truth or the producing of a single valuable impression.

B.

An Address at the Funeral of the Hon. Thomas A. Davis, Mayor of Boston, delivered in Central Church, on Tuesday, November 25, 1845. By JOHN PIERCE, D. D., Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Brookline. Boston. 1845. 8vo. pp. 24.

Do Justly. A Sermon preached at Dorchester, on Sunday, Dec. 14, 1845. By NATHANIEL HALL, Pastor of the First Church. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 8vo. pp. 16.

A Word for Peace. A Christmas Discourse. By WILLIAM H. FURNESS. December 25, 1845. Philadelphia. 1845. 8vo. pp. 14.

Peace the Demand of Christianity. A Sermon preached in the South Congregational Church, December 28, 1845. By F. D. HUNTINGTON. Boston: L. C. Bowles. 1846. 8vo. pp. 24.

The Idea of a Christian Church. A Discourse at the Installation of Theodore Parker as Minister of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Church in Boston, January 4, 1846. Delivered by HIMSELF. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 8vo. pp. 39.

The Comparative Importance of Foreign and Domestic Missions; including Statistics of Education, Philanthropy, Crime, &c. in Albany: A Discourse, preached January 7, 1846. By HENRY F. HARRINGTON, Minister of the First Unitarian Society in Albany. Albany. 1846. 8vo. pp. 30.

A Sermon delivered before his Excellency George N. Briggs Governor, his Honor John Reed, Lieutenant Governor, the Honorable Council, and the Legislature of Massachusetts, at the Annual Election, Wednesday, January 7, 1846. By GEORGE PUTNAM, Minister of the First Church in Roxbury. Boston. 1846. 8vo. pp. 31.

Discourses delivered on taking leave of the Old Church of the East Society in Salem, December 28, 1845; and the Dedication of their New Church, January 1, 1846. By JAMES FLINT, D. D., Pastor of the East Church. Salem. 1846. 8vo. pp. 48.

A Lecture on the Origin and Development of the First Constituents of Civilization. By FRANCIS LIEBER. Columbia, S. C. 1845. 8vo. pp. 18.

An Address on the Annexation of Texas, and the Aspect of Slavery in the United States, in connection therewith: delivered in Boston November 14, and 18, 1845. By STEPHEN C. PHILLIPS. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 12mo. pp. 56.

Fragments of Medical Science and Art. An Address delivered before the Boylston Medical Society of Harvard University. By HENRY JACOB BIGELOW, M. D., President of the Society. Boston: W. D. Ticknor & Co. 1846. 8vo. pp. 54.

Harvard College and its Benefactors. Boston: Little & Brown. 8vo. pp. 37.

Letter of the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers, to Rev. John Pierpont, with his Reply. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 8vo. pp. 16.

A Letter to the so-called "Boston Churches," which are in truth only Parts of One Church. By a MEMBER OF THE SAME. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1846. 8vo. pp. 24.

A Letter from the Hollis Street Society, to their Unitarian Brethren, with the Documents relating to a recent call of a Minister, by that Society. Published according to a vote of the Society. Boston. 1846. 8vo. pp. 40.

THE funeral Address by Dr. Pierce embodies his own personal recollections of the childhood and youth of the late Mayor, gives a brief sketch of his life and character, and is an affectionate tribute to the memory of an upright and good man.—The

claims of justice, in its various applications in the conduct of business and in the relations of social life, are treated in Mr. Hall's Sermon with a simplicity and directness, which we should be glad always to find in the instructions of the pulpit. — Mr. Furness's Christmas Discourse administers a severe rebuke to the spirit of war which prevails in the seats of political influence, and is timely as well as firm in its vindication of Christian principles. — Mr. Huntington, too — as did most of our preachers, we suppose, at the season of Christmas — sounds a peace note, glances at the consequences of war between this country and Great Britain, and utters an animating word for all, who are looking forward with "hope of yet happier days." — Mr. Parker's Discourse gives an exposition of his views of a Christian church and its action, "first on its own members, and then, through their means, on others out of its pale." Setting aside what is peculiar in the writer's speculative theology, the discourse contains a great deal that is good and true; it is a plain-speaking and animated performance, mostly practical, though some censures are expressed or implied, about the justness of which, of course, there will be a difference of opinion. — For the topics of Mr. Harrington's Discourse we must refer our readers to the ample title given above, and content ourselves with saying, that it breathes throughout a spirit of ardent philanthropy, and that a portion of the statistics, that especially, which relates to the public schools of Albany, leaves on our minds a painful impression of the deficiencies of the city. — Mr. Putnam urges the necessity of religion to the prosperity of the State, not on the old ground of the union of Church and State, nor on the ground of expediency, for religion must spring from a deeper source; it is not born of calculation; our fathers did not become Christians, that they might establish a "well-ordered-Commonwealth," but being Christians they founded it; and its prosperity depends on the continued prevalence of the Christian element in the hearts of the people. This idea is variously illustrated; the education of the young is referred to, and the topic of religious instruction in our Colleges is treated at some length, with special reference to the late discussions concerning Harvard. — Dr. Flint's two Discourses on taking leave of the old church are, as such discourses should be, historical, with appropriate reflections. That at the dedication of the new edifice passes by a happy transition from "material" to "spiritual renovation," and leads the thoughts up to the great object of Christianity, which is, in the highest sense, to "make all things new." The three are written in the author's usual easy and agreeable style, and form a valuable record of the religious society of which he is pastor.

Dr. Lieber denies that the elements of civilization have their origin either in instinct, or chance, in conscious action, or inspiration; they arise, he maintains, "out of the relation in which

man is placed to the material world." These points he argues at considerable length, and with some variety of illustration.—Though Mr. Phillips's Address, so far as intended to help in preventing Annexation, like the endeavors of many others, proved unavailing, yet both as a record of honest effort, and as containing much strong argument relating to the "political influences" of Slavery, and its connexion with our present Constitution, it will not only reward a careful perusal, but should be preserved among the documents to which by their character belongs a permanent interest.—The Address of Dr. Bigelow is rich in allusions to the methods and results of past scientific discovery, and endeavors to place theory and facts in their true relations, with special reference to medical study and practice. It is full of thought, and carefully written.—The ably written pamphlet on "Harvard College and its Benefactors" meets, and we think, successfully refutes the "two classes of complaints made against the College," the first arising from the assumption that the College is the "child of the State," and the second from the assumption of its sectarianism. Under the first head it is shown, that the benefactions of individuals to the College have vastly exceeded those made by the State, and yet five-eighths of the Board of Overseers are annually elected by the people, the State thus exerting a comparative weight of influence to which it is not entitled by the amount of its grants. The remarks of the writer on the second charge appear to us perfectly sound, and it is about time, we think, that the complaint of the sectarianism of the College should cease.—Mr. Pierpont having seen proper to submit to the public the correspondence which passed between him and the Boston Association of ministers, originating in their exercise of fraternal feelings at the close of his connexion with them, the public can judge of the spirit in which it was conducted.—The "Letter to the so-called 'Boston Churches'" is an attempt, evidently an honest one, to bring about a union between Christians—Trinitarians and Unitarians—on the common ground of holiness and love, or "a life of Christ in the soul, wholly distinct from the life of the world, which flowing into many spirits, makes them the true Church." They are true believers in Christ, it asserts, who adopt Peter's confession—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." There is occasionally a little mistiness in its language, but it breathes a good spirit.—The Letter from the Hollis Street Society contains a statement of recent proceedings, made on behalf of "the Proprietors of the meetinghouse," with their letters to Messrs. Peabody and Fosdick covering an invitation to settle with them, the replies of those gentlemen, and the protests which a minority also addressed to them. We are glad to believe that an unhappy controversy is now brought to a close.

INTELLIGENCE.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Ecclesiastical Record. — Our readers will observe, on turning to our record a page or two further on, how large a number of ordinations and installations have taken place since our last publication. We already know that in May we shall have occasion to report several more. It is plain, that if in these days the pastoral connexion is too easily dissolved, our congregations are disposed to reestablish the ministry among them as soon as possible. We cannot but hope that the evil of brief terms of professional life, arising from frequent changes in the parochial relations of ministers, has reached its height, and that we may soon witness a return towards the old ways. We have been glad to notice that in one or two recent instances the ecclesiastical Council, called to introduce a minister to his charge by solemn religious services, have prefixed to the usual vote that they would proceed to such services, an expression of their regret that a condition had been included in the terms of settlement, by which the connexion between the minister and the people might be terminated by a simple notice to that effect given by either of the parties. A similar course pursued by other Councils convened for the same purpose might check a practice, which has been permitted to grow up among us, we are confident, without due consideration of its probable effects. — The last two months have brought fewer *removals* than usual within our knowledge. — Rev. Mr. Kingsley of Stow has resigned his connexion with the church in that place. — Rev. Mr. Barry, who, as we stated in our last number, was on the point of removing to Lowell to become the minister of the second Unitarian society in that city, has been obliged, by a return of serious physical indisposition, to relinquish all purpose of pursuing the labors of the ministry at present. — Rev. Andrew Bigelow, D. D., and Rev. Samuel B. Croft have become the successors of Rev. Messrs. Waterston and Sargent in the ministry-at-large, in connexion with the Pitts Street and Suffolk Street chapels in this city. — The congregation at East Boston which has been for some time attending on the instructions of Rev. C. A. Farley, has been legally organized, under the title of the "Unitarian Society of East Boston." — A new society has been formed at Mattapoisett, a seaport village in the town of Rochester, Mass. — A third Unitarian society has been gathered in the city of New York, under the ministry of Rev. Mr. Wellington, of the commencement of whose labors there we spoke in our last number. They hold their meetings, as we understand, in Grand street, in the Eastern part of the city.

Condition of Unitarianism. — Evidences multiply upon us of the spread of Unitarian opinions, and of the increased ability and stability of our religious societies. Besides the gathering of new churches, we hear of the renunciation of Trinitarianism by ministers who have

formerly been its public teachers. Several of our old houses of worship have been remodelled, or replaced by new and more convenient edifices. We especially rejoice to see that our congregations are taking advantage of the prosperous condition of the country, to relieve themselves of the embarrassment or inconvenience of debt. — The church at St. Louis, Mo., under the care of Rev. Mr. Eliot, have within the last year freed themselves from debt by a voluntary subscription of more than \$8,000 for this single purpose. — The society in Montreal, Canada, of which Rev. Mr. Cordner is minister, have just raised by subscription from their own members \$1,000, by which they have cancelled all their liabilities, except for the land on which their house stands, to extinguish which a sinking fund has been established, that will amount to a sum sufficient for this purpose when the prescribed time of payment arrives. — The Unitarian congregations in and about Salem, Mass., have united themselves for the purpose of sustaining missionary operations in Essex county, and have, in reference to this object, adopted the name of the "Fraternity of Unitarian Churches in Salem and Vicinity." It includes the four congregations in Salem, and those in Beverly, Danvers, Lynn, Marblehead, and Gloucester. We understand that Rev. Mr. Stone of North Beverly will be employed by them as a preacher in that neighborhood. — An Association of a somewhat similar character has been formed in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, the design and plan of which give promise of much usefulness. It has taken the name of the "Unitarian Association of the State of New York," and is meant to include not only the members of the congregations in those two cities, but the Unitarians of Fishkill, Albany, Troy, Trenton, Syracuse, Vernon, Rochester, and Buffalo, where regular societies exist, and any others of our faith in any part of the State. Zebedee Cook Esq., has been chosen *President*; Moses H. Grinnell Esq., *Vice President*; Messrs. P. M. Irving, George Ireland, S. J. Beals, Richard Warren, Seth Low, and W. H. Carey, *Directors*; William B. Allen, *Treasurer*; and James A. Cleveland, *Secretary*. The object of the Association is, in general, to promote the interests of Unitarian Christianity within the limits of the State; and the suggestions made in an "Address" which they have put forth, respecting the methods to be pursued for this end, show that the plan originated with wise and energetic men. — The first annual Catalogue of the Meadville Theological School justifies the officers of the institution in "congratulating its friends upon its flourishing condition." The three classes contain twenty-three students, of whom fourteen have entered this year. The Library "has been increased the past year by an addition of 900 volumes — making in the whole 1,400 volumes;" besides "800 volumes of text books; the use of which is given to the students during their connection with the School." The plan of studies is comprehensive, and the Professors are indefatigable in their attention to the classes. — The rapid sale which Unitarian books obtain is a circumstance to which we can also refer with pleasure. The first edition of Mrs. Dana's Letters on the Trinity, published last September and consisting of 1250 copies, has been sold, and the work is now in process of being stereotyped. The whole of the first edition of the Memoir of Henry Ware jr., by his Brother, consisting of 1,500 copies, has been exhausted in two months, and a stereotype edition on larger type is now in press.

Missionary Subscription.—The Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association have issued a "Circular to the Unitarian Clergy and People," in reference to the Missionary interest which was placed under their charge on the dissolution of the special Missionary Committee the last spring. This latter Committee was appointed in the year 1841, when an effort was made to raise the annual sum of \$10,000, in addition to the former subscriptions to our various religious Associations. Some time elapsed before the Committee were able to perform the service entrusted to them, and but two years' subscription to the Missionary Fund was collected, when, on account of the inconvenience of a double organization, it was thought best to transfer the business of the Missionary Committee to the Committee of the Unitarian Association. With these facts our readers are probably familiar, though we do not recollect that they have been before distinctly presented on our pages. The "Circular," besides a forcible and timely appeal in behalf of "the cause of Missions," contains some statements which may not be so generally known.

"The collections of the first year exceeded somewhat ten thousand dollars, which was the sum proposed to be raised; and, in the second year, they amounted to over twelve thousand dollars; the sum total in the two years, being \$22,665,90.

"Of these two collections, \$15,321,80 have been transferred, in accordance with the special directions of the donors, to various societies and individuals throughout the country, by whom they have been disbursed; \$3,083,12 have been distributed by the Board itself to the American Unitarian Association; \$1,362,95 to the Evangelical Missionary Society; and \$1,432,17 to the Society for Promoting Theological Education;—to be appropriated by each of them in fostering the particular objects to which their action is confined. The small balance of \$1,340,32 has been expended by the Board in paying the salary and travelling expenses of the Agent, for missionary lectures, printing, postage and rent. Of the \$15,321,80 specially appropriated by the donors, \$12,226,51 were directed to be divided, in various proportions, between the three Societies above named.

* * * * *

"With the desire of enabling the Association to maintain and increase its sphere of usefulness, the Missionary Board, in June last, dissolved its organization, — and transferred its books and papers, and with them the duties and responsibilities which had rested upon them, and which they had so ably and successfully sustained, to the Executive Committee of this Board. * * * But though this work has now passed into our hands, and will be henceforth conducted by us according to our best judgment and ability, no change has taken place in the plan originally proposed to be pursued. Yourself and all other persons in the denomination will be at liberty, as heretofore, to direct that the sums, which they may please to transmit, shall be appropriated for the use of the Evangelical Missionary Society, of the Society for the promotion of Theological Education, or of any other institution or object they may name; and they may rest assured that such direction shall be strictly complied with. At the same time, it may not be inappropriate to remark that this Association, from its position and the duties which necessarily devolve upon it, must be best acquainted with the religious condition and wants of all our institutions and of all sections of the country, and are [is] most likely to disburse the sums that they [it] may receive in such manner as shall effect the greatest amount of good."

We may in this connexion notice the last Annual Report of the Society for propagating the Gospel among the Indians and others in North America, from which it appears that \$1,050 were appropriated the last year to missions at the West, and \$500 "for the benefit of the Cherokee Indians," in aid of the mission and school which the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions have established among them; besides other appropriations nearer home. The pamphlet before us also contains extracts from a very interesting Report made by Rev. S. K. Lothrop, who in June last visited portions of Michigan and Wisconsin, to ascertain what prospects of usefulness there might be, to encourage the establishment of missions by this Society "among the Indian tribes on our Western borders."

Unitarianism in England. — Our accounts of the condition of the Unitarian body in the United Kingdom are on the whole favorable. So great are the social disadvantages under which the profession of Unitarianism must be made in England, that we can expect only a slow increase in the number or strength of the congregations bearing this name. The progress and results of Puseyism have led the friends of the Establishment to a more active zeal in its behalf, while the prejudice of the Orthodox Dissenters against those who do not embrace what they are pleased to call evangelical doctrines finds no abatement. Unitarianism, exposed on either hand to hatred and opposition, may congratulate itself on any evidence which it may be able to furnish of growth or triumph over difficulties. Internal differences, too, tend to weaken the energies of the denomination. The same question which has been so freely discussed here — the value of historical Christianity — has given rise to two parties there, who, while they respect each other's characters and motives, find themselves unable to sympathize on some points of grave import. The Editor of the *Christian Reformer*, after alluding to the "agitation and division" which have befallen not only the Established Church, but every Dissenting denomination, as presenting "signs of the times such as to call forth in the Unitarians of England a bold and united effort for the advancement of their principles" as "the only cure for the obvious evils of the religious world," adds — "But alas! we too are divided, and have first to settle what truth is, before we can go forth an united band to confute error and rebuke intolerance."

Still we find ground of encouragement in the general aspects of the denomination. The passage of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill has been followed by the renovation, in several instances, of ancient chapels, for which the congregations were unwilling to incur great expense, while it was uncertain whether they should retain the possession. A late number of the *Reformer* gives a list of thirty-five "chapels that have been or are immediately to be rebuilt or repaired," at an expense varying from £70 to £5,000; two of which only are in Ireland — the others being all in England. Frequent communications in the *Inquirer* — the London Unitarian weekly journal, the circulation and influence of which, we are glad to learn, are increasing — show that a greater interest than was manifested in former years, is felt in the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. In the West of England, particularly, our friends seem to be animated with stronger purposes and to be engaged in giving more efficiency to their

labors in the cause of truth and righteousness. Willing to look facts in the face, they are bent upon infusing energy where there has been languor and depression. A Society has been formed under the title of "The Western Unitarian Christian Union," the object of which "shall be to promote the knowledge and practice of pure Christianity, and the worship of one God the Father, through his Son Jesus Christ, in the six Western Counties" of Gloucester, Wilts, Somerset, Dorset, Devon, and Cornwall. In the Address which the "Provisional Committee" have published it is stated, that the Society has grown out of a belief that "our views of Christianity have not of late years made such progress as might have been fairly anticipated. Congregations in the Western Counties, known by the name of Presbyterian, Unitarian, and General Baptist, are even fewer now than they were fifty years ago. In some cases our societies have continued to prosper, and their numbers have considerably increased; but in others there has been an obvious decline." The "Western Unitarian Christian Union" will "be connected with the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, in accordance with the Rule requiring the payment of £5 per annum, and allowing two representatives to be sent to the annual meeting of the Association.

The support given to Unitarian journals, is a circumstance which we notice with pleasure. Besides the "Inquirer" to which we have just alluded, and which is edited with much ability; and the "Reformer," published monthly under the judicious direction of Rev. R. B. Aspland; and the "Prospective Review," the last number of which contains a long article on "Theodore Parker's Discourse of Religion," the writer of which, while in some points he differs from Mr. Parker, bestows upon him and his work the most sincere admiration;—a new periodical has been started in London, under the name of the "Unitarian," "designed to furnish the public with correct information of the principles of the Unitarian's faith." It will be published monthly, in 12mo. at the very low price of three pence, by Mr. Mardon. The "Bible Christian" of Belfast has been enlarged, and will in future appear under the title of the "Irish Unitarian Magazine and Bible Christian." It promises to give its readers a history of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, prepared by Rev. Dr. Montgomery at the request of the Remonstrant Synod. The Christian Pioneer, established by Rev. George Harris in 1826, and conducted by him first at Glasgow, and afterwards at Edinburgh, has been discontinued on account of his removal to Newcastle.

The death of Rev. Mr. Aspland of Hackney, after a long illness, has produced a wide sense of loss at his removal, and called forth many expressions of grateful remembrance of his services.

Ministry at Large.—This noble institution, the genuine fruit of Christian faith, is extending its benefits both in this country and in Great Britain. There are now four ministers connected with the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches in this city;—Rev. Dr. Bigelow, who labors principally in the North and West parts of the city; Rev. Mr. Cruft, who confines his visits chiefly to the poor at the South end; Rev. Mr. Burton, who has been employed for many months in collecting the statistics of Pauperism over the whole city; and Rev. Mr. Barnard, of the Warren Street Chapel, who devotes himself especially to the children in that neighborhood. — In Lowell the minis-

try at large, established by the "South Parish," has been conducted for more than a year by Rev. Horatio Wood, with great diligence and success. — In Baltimore, Md., Rev. Mr. Capen, whose first Quarterly Report has just appeared, has been invited "to continue his labors among the destitute of that city, as a missionary of the Board" of Trustees of the ministry at large. — Steps have been taken to establish a similar ministry in Portsmouth, N. H. — Other denominations are also prosecuting the work with industry and success. A very neat and commodious stone chapel has been erected in this city for the use of the Domestic Mission supported by the Episcopalians, of which Rev. E. M. P. Wells is the minister.

The Domestic Mission in London appears to have been conducted the present winter with unusual spirit. At Spicer Street chapel it has been thought best to have a course of Sunday evening "Controversial Lectures" delivered by different ministers, to remove the misapprehensions in regard to the faith of Unitarians, which were found to be impediments to the missionary's usefulness in that section of the city. A course of "Lectures to the Working Classes" has been given on Wednesday evenings, in the Temperance Hall, Milton street, by different scientific gentlemen, which has afforded much gratification to those for whom they were designed. On Christmas eve the children of all the Mission schools, to the number of four or five hundred, "most of them from abodes of dirt and wretchedness," were entertained at the hall in Milton street, where a Christmas tree was provided by their teachers and other friends. — The "Sixth Report of Lewin's Mead Meeting Domestic Mission Society," in Bristol, presents various evidence of the devotedness of their missionary, Rev. Mr. Bayley. Besides his Sunday evening Services in the chapel, and Wednesday evening Readings, he speaks of a Sunday afternoon service in private houses, where the number present on the first occasion was only three — yet he was not discouraged; of the Sunday School; the Library; the Loan Fund; the Provident Fund; the Mutual Assistance and Improvement Society; the Sick Club; and the Tracts which he had written for the benefit of those among whom he labors. — The Eighth Annual Report of Rev. Mr. Johns, minister to the poor in Liverpool, which we have been for a long time intending to notice, affords similar proof of judicious and earnest efforts for the elevation of those who are sunk in want and sin. We observe particularly that he speaks of an addition of "eight acres of land to the allotments;" and says, "There will now be 143 gardens. Every shilling of the rent has hitherto been paid, and we hope that so simple a mode of eking out the poor man's income will extend itself from year to year." — The Fifth Annual Report of the "Birmingham Unitarian Domestic Mission Society," with the address of the missionary, Rev. Mr. Bowring, has also been some time on our table. It is a particularly interesting pamphlet, and exhibits the mission in Birmingham in a state of unusual prosperity. A new chapel and school rooms have been erected, at a large expense. "The congregation occasionally numbers nearly 300;" "about sixty communicants" have in one instance partaken of the Lord's supper; the number of children in the Sunday schools is 330; day schools have also been established; and a Library and a Savings' Club are made to extend the blessings of this admirable institution.

Ordinations and Installations. — REV. PAUL DEAN, formerly of this city, was installed as Pastor of the First Congregational Church in EASTON, Mass., December 24, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Barrett of Boston, from Ephesians iv. 1.; the Installation Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Sanger of Dover; the Charge was given by Rev. Dr. Lamson of Dedham; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Huntoon of Canton; the Address to the Society, by Rev. Mr. Gray of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Brigham of Taunton, Russell of Hingham, and Bradford of Bridgewater.

REV. THOMAS HILL, a member of the class last graduated at the Divinity School, was ordained as Pastor of the Independent Congregational Church and Society in WALTHAM, Mass., December 24, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Bellows of New York, from Ephesians iv. 3 — 6; the Ordaining Prayer was made by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Natick; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Stetson of Medford; the Fellowship of the Churches, by Rev. Mr. May of Leicester; the Address to the People by Rev. Mr. Ripley of Waltham; and the other services, by Rev. Dr. Field of Weston, Rev. Mr. Newell of Cambridge, and Rev. Mr. Frost of Concord.

REV. THEODORE PARKER, late of Roxbury, was recognized as Minister of the "Twenty-eighth Congregational Church" in Boston, Mass., on Sunday, January 4, 1846. The ceremony consisted of a statement by John G. King Esq., Chairman of the Committee who had conducted the affairs of the Society, of their proceedings in securing the services of Mr. Parker, and of their belief that according to the principles of Congregationalism they were competent to settle their own minister; of the confirmation, on the part of the congregation by rising from their seats, of the proceedings of the Committee; and of Mr. Parker's verbal assent to the terms on which the connexion was formed. After which the usual morning services proceeded.

REV. HENRY FREDERICK BOND, of Boston, a member of the last Senior class in the Cambridge Divinity School, was ordained as Colleague Pastor, (with Rev. Dr. Thompson,) over the First Congregational Church and Society in BARRE, Mass., January 7, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Lothrop of Boston, from Luke xvii. 21; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Clarke of Boston; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Lincoln of Fitchburg; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Allen of Roxbury; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Thompson of Salem; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Nute of Petersham, and Greene of Brookfield.

REV. EPHRAIM PEABODY, late of New Bedford, was inducted into office as Minister of the King's Chapel in Boston, Mass., on Sunday, January 11, 1846. The service was conducted by the Wardens, according to the usage of the Society in the settlement of their last three ministers; and consisted in a statement, by the Senior Warden, of the proceedings which had been adopted in relation to Mr. Peabody; the assent of the congregation to the choice which had been made of him as their minister, expressed by a unanimous Ay; the delivery of the Bible to Mr. Peabody, with some remarks, by the Warden; and prayers offered by Mr. Peabody. After which the usual morning services proceeded.

REV. WILLIAM P. HUNTINGTON, late of Hillsboro', Ill., was installed

as Pastor of the Unitarian Church and Society in ASHBY, Mass., January 14, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Huntington of Boston, from 1 Corinthians xv. 34; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Lincoln of Fitchburg; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Stetson of Medford; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Muzzey of Cambridge; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Babbidge of Pepperell, Chandler of Shirley, and White of Littleton.

Rev. FRANK PARKER APPLETON, of Dorchester, a recent graduate from the Cambridge Divinity School, was ordained as Pastor of the First Unitarian Church and Society in DANVERS, Mass., January 14, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Hall of Dorchester, from Luke xviii. 8; the Prayer of Ordination was offered by Rev. Dr. Flint of Salem; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Boston; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Withington of Leominster; the Address to the Society, by Rev. Mr. Sargent of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Thompson of Salem, Allen of Roxbury, and Bartlett of Marblehead.

Rev. JOHN H. MORISON, formerly of New Bedford, was installed as Pastor of the First Congregational Parish in MILTON, Mass., January 28, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Boston, from Matthew vii. 28; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Lunt of Quincy; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Putnam of Roxbury; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Bartol of Boston; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Angier, their late Pastor; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Huntoon of Canton, and Pike, and Hall of Dorchester.

Rev. JOHN FARWELL MOORS, who was graduated the last year at the Cambridge Divinity School, was ordained as Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in DEERFIELD, Mass., January 28, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Clarke of Boston, from 2 Corinthians v. 17-20; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Willard of Deerfield, who has for the fourth time been called to participate in the settlement of a minister over the congregation which he served in all faithfulness, till physical infirmities made him desirous of a release from professional labors; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Robinson of Medfield; the Right Hand of Fellowship by Rev. Mr. Smith of Groton; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Huntington of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Nute of Petersham, Brown of Brattleboro', Vt., and Nightingale of Springfield.

Rev. S. H. LLOYD, formerly of Marlboro', was installed as Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in HUBBARDSTON, Mass., February 4, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Hill of Worcester, from 1 Corinthians ix. 16; the Installing Prayer was made by Rev. Mr. Lincoln of Fitchburg; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Stetson of Medford; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. May of Leicester; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Allen of Northboro'; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Alger of Marlboro', Greene of Brookfield, and Wellington of Templeton.

Rev. JOHN T. SARGENT, late minister of the Suffolk Street Chapel, in Boston, was installed as Pastor of the First Congregational Church in SOMERVILLE, Mass., February 18, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Furness of Philadelphia, Penn., from John xiii. 31; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Gannett of

Boston; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Pierpont of Troy, N. Y.; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Clarke of Boston; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Stetson of Medford; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Lambert, Hodges, and Newell, of Cambridge.

REV. ASARELAH M. BRIDGE, late of Standish, Me., was installed as Colleague Pastor (with Rev. T. F. Rogers) of the First Congregational Church and Society in BERNARDSTON, Mass., February 18, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Robbins of Boston, from John x. 16; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Harding of New Salem; the Charge was given by Rev. Dr. Willard of Deerfield; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Everett of Northfield; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Willis of Walpole, N. H.; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Moors of Deerfield, Barlow of Warwick, and Stearns of Rowe.

Dedications.—The First Congregational Society in EASTON, Mass., having erected a new meetinghouse, in place of the one in which their fathers had worshipped, it was dedicated to religious uses December 24, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Dean, pastor elect of the church, from Psalm cxxii. 1; the Dedication Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Russell of Hingham; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Ballou of Stoughton, Forbes of West Bridgewater, and Bradford of Bridgewater.

The beautiful meetinghouse recently erected by the East Society in SALEM, Mass., and into which they have removed from the house which their fathers consecrated to the purposes of Christian worship nearly 130 years ago, was dedicated January 1, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Flint, the pastor of the church, from Revelation xxi. 5; the Prayer of Dedication was offered by Rev. Dr. Brazer of Salem; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Pierpont of Lynn, Thompson of Salem, and Thayer of Beverly.

The meetinghouse, intended by the First Congregational Society in ROWE, Mass. to replace their old house of worship, was dedicated January 21, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Stearns, the Pastor of the church, from Exodus xx. 24; the Dedicatory Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Everett of Northfield; an Address to the Society was made by Mr. A. B. Fuller of Cambridge; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Bridge of Bernardston, Field of Charlemont, and Ballou of Whitingham, Vt.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Harvard College.—Our readers do not need to be informed that the vacancy created by the resignation of President Quincy has been filled. At the annual meeting of the Board of Overseers, January 22, 1846, a communication was received from the Corporation informing the Overseers, that they had made choice of Hon. Edward Everett as President; and at the adjourned meeting on the 5th of February, to which time the rules of the Board required that it should lie over, the

choice of the Corporation was *unanimously* confirmed, and EDWARD EVERETT was declared by Governor Briggs, the presiding officer, to have been duly elected President of Harvard College. The whole number of votes cast was 64; and it was a most gratifying circumstance, that they were all in the affirmative. A Committee was appointed to inform Mr. Everett of his election, who at a subsequent meeting on the 19th of February reported that he had signified his acceptance of the office, and his readiness to enter on its duties whenever the Corporation should desire. We know not whether Mr. Everett or the public has more occasion to rejoice in the favorable circumstances under which he will commence his Presidency. In respect to its financial and literary interests the College was never in a better position, and the discipline of the institution was never better maintained than it has been during the Presidency *pro tem.* of Dr. Walker. The Law School has found in the redoubled exertions of Professor Greenleaf all the compensation which it was possible to afford for the loss of Judge Story, while the Divinity and Medical Schools have continued to enjoy the usual measure of public favor. The whole number of Undergraduates, as given on the Catalogue published last September, is 279; of Theological Students, 32; Law Students, 145; Students attending Medical Lectures, 157; Resident Graduates, 15; Total 628.

At the meeting of the Overseers February 5, other nominations made by the Corporation were acted upon. Benjamin R. Curtis Esq., of Boston, was *unanimously* chosen one of the Fellows, in the place of the late Judge Story. Hon. Stephen C. Phillips of Salem was chosen a member of the Board of Overseers, in the place of the late Mr. Saltonstall; Rev. Daniel Sharp, D. D., of Boston, in the place of Rev. Dr. Jenks, whose seat became vacant on his resignation of his ministry; and Jacob Bigelow, M. D. of Boston, to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Dr. Jackson. Each of these gentlemen was elected by a large majority, Dr. Sharp receiving 56, out of 58 votes.

At the meeting January 22, a Report was read by Judge Shaw, chairman of a Committee appointed last winter "to consider the expediency of disconnecting entirely the Theological Department from the College, and of providing that there shall be no preaching to the students in the chapel, or religious exercises other than morning and evening prayers." After a review of the history of theological education in the University, and an examination of the "gifts and grants" from which have accrued the funds for this purpose, the Report concludes that

"Donations having been made to this body, and accepted by them, upon these trusts, for the purpose, not only of founding, but of perpetuating a department within the College for the promotion of Theological Science as a branch of University Education, the Committee are of opinion, that the College Government, and all those entrusted, for the time being, with the administration of its affairs, are under a legal, moral and conscientious obligation to retain the property so given, and faithfully to apply it to promote the objects for which it was entrusted to them; and that they have no power, in law or equity, to transfer the property, and confide these trusts to any other person or corporation."

The Committee therefore were of opinion, "that it is not expedient for the Board of Overseers to make any recommendation to the Cor-

poration, or to take any further order on the subject." A question of great importance has been put to rest by this very clear and able report. In regard to the other subject referred to them, the Committee were of opinion, "that it is not expedient to make any express recommendation to the Corporation, or to take any further order on the subject." The Report was accepted without debate, at the adjourned meeting.

The Corporation, it is understood, had made choice of Rev. George Putnam, D. D., of Roxbury, as Hollis Professor of Divinity, but he having seen fit to decline the appointment, it was not communicated to the Overseers. Dr. Putnam's removal to Cambridge, though earnestly desired by the friends of the College, was so strenuously opposed, not only by his own congregation, but by all the citizens of Roxbury, that he felt it to be his duty to remain with his people. From Judge Shaw's Report it appears, that "the income from the fund" of the Hollis Professorship, "estimated at 5 per cent., is about \$200;" that is, about one-tenth part of what would be necessary for the support of a Professor. The fund given by Hollis "was small, not exceeding about \$2,600; and a few small additions from other sources, of about \$1,300, made it about \$4,000." The Massachusetts Professorship of Natural History, which has been for some time vacant, the Dane Professorship of Law, held by the late Judge Story, and the Rumford Professorship, which Professor Treadwell has resigned on account of ill health, remain to be filled by the Corporation.

Rather less than a year ago we spoke of the College as "passing through a trial," such, however, as it had often encountered before. We congratulate its friends that it has passed through this trial with an increased security against future assaults upon the liberal principles on which it has long been conducted. The attempt to introduce a change has met with a defeat, which we regard with the more satisfaction, because it has been brought about by the clear expression of public sentiment, in rebuke of those who, whether for political or religious ends, would have removed the institution from the control of its present guardians.

Errata. — In the haste of revising the final sheets of our last number, we overlooked two errors, each of which, if we should allow it to stand uncorrected, might justly subject us to the imputation of wishing to mislead our readers. The signature to the first notice on page 147 should be E. And in our "Notice" on page 160, we should have said, that the enlargement of our journal would make an addition of *thirty-six* pages to each volume. We did not perceive our mistake of including six numbers in a volume till after the page was printed. An error also occurred on page 138, where the 5th line from the bottom should have been — Note to Article III. In an earlier page, also, of the number, p. 27, the last line, "fourscore" should be *forty*.

* * * Our readers will not find fault with our again adding four pages to the regular size of our number.